THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX SEPTEMBER, 1956 No. 435

S.P.C.K.: CHANGE OF ADDRESS

FROM 3 September 1956, the headquarters of S.P.C.K. will be Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1. All correspondence connected with THEOLOGY that has hitherto been addressed to Northumberland Avenue should in future be addressed to Holy Trinity Church, as above. This does not apply to retail orders for books, which should now be addressed to the S.P.C.K. Bookshop, 322 Regent Street, London, W.1. Editorial correspondence should continue, until 15 December, to be addressed to 8 The Cloisters, Windsor Castle; after that date, the Editor's address will be King's College, Cambridge.

Editorial

THE presence of Father Gabriel Hebert, S.S.M., in the antipodes is England's loss but Australia's gain. Happily readers in England can share in the benefit of a lecture which he delivered last year to the Melbourne College of Divinity, since it has been published and is available in this country.[1] It is entitled *Theology and Theological Study*, and it is the kind of booklet that professors, supervisors, and principals of theological colleges may be glad to know of, so that they can place it in the hands of their pupils. There could scarcely be provided in so short a space a better introduction to the subject-matter of theology, its appropriate methods, and its relation to other sciences both natural and human. Among other things, Father Hebert corrects the common misconception that theology is primarily concerned with religion and of interest only to religious people or to candidates for the Church's ministry. Here his emphasis is the same as that of F. D. Maurice. As regards the vexed question whether theology is a "science", he adopts a saying of Father Kelly's that it is "a reversed science". "Since it deals with God as the Creator of the world, the Ground of all existence, it is related to all man's knowledge of the world, and to all the sciences that there are; but it approaches their subject-matter from a different direction . . . endeavouring to see what it all means in the light of God's purpose for his world." This is of course to make an august claim for theology, but Father Hebert is equally insistent on the limitations under which theologians work and on the danger of forgetting that their treasure is always contained in earthen vessels. The lecture includes a concise explanation of Professor Paul Tillich's teaching about Heteronomy,

[1] *Theology and Theological Study*. Angus and Robertson (105 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.). 2s. 6d.

Autonomy, and Theonomy, and also a useful analysis of the many disciplines that are involved in the study of the Bible.

* * * * *

The time has not yet come when the full story of the French priest-workmen or worker-priests can be told. It was an adventure of which many Christians outside France would like to know more, because it is rightly felt that it touched the nerve of the Church's mission today. How is the Gospel to acquire meaning for a dechristianized industrial society? In France this question is particularly acute; for the gulf between the industrial proletariat and the Church is much wider there than it is even in Britain. By the same token, it may be that more radical and dramatic missionary measures were called for there than here. Anyhow, one can gratefully learn from the experiences of the priest-workmen and deplore Rome's virtual abolition of their enterprise, without wishing to see it precisely copied in Britain or under the auspices of the Church of England. But if we say that an experiment on these lines would not serve to embody the Gospel in our own industrial world, it none the less makes us ask whether anything equally imaginative, sacrificial and incarnational is being done here in the name of the Church as a whole. *The Worker-Priests*,[1] which is described as "a collective documentation", is perhaps the most useful impression of the French movement that can at present be given. Readers should, however, be warned that it is not in the form of a consecutive history or an orderly exposition. It is rather like a capacious scrapbook made up of cuttings from newspapers and reviews, together with some of the most important documents that were issued both by the hierarchy and by the priest-workmen themselves. The contents of the volume are in many ways moving, and they cannot fail to stimulate the desire for fuller information about what the priest-workmen actually did, and what the large number of them, who refused to abandon their mission in March 1954, are doing now. When the history of the Church in the twentieth century vis-à-vis the world comes to be written, this brave adventure and its official rejection may be symbolical of much besides. The Church of Rome has the habit of suppressing its pioneers, but it does at least produce them.

Buddhism Today, and its Appeal to Modern Man

THE year A.D. 1956 is the year 2500 of the Buddhist Era, and naturally is an occasion for great celebration by world Buddhism. This is all the more so since there is an old Buddhist tradition that the year 2500 B.E. would inaugurate a great revival of the Buddha's teaching, and even that the Buddhist Messiah may then appear. What is regarded as the Sixth General Council of Buddhism has been meeting near Rangoon for some time, and its conclusion has been planned to coincide with the celebrations of this year. The great annual celebration of Wesak at the end of May, commemorating the

[1] Routledge and Kegan Paul, 25s.

Buddha's birth enlightenment and death, was of course celebrated by Buddhists everywhere in a special way this year. And an International Conference of Buddhist scholars is to be held in Rangoon in November: a big exhibition of Buddhist art is to be held there at the same time.

Last century it used to be said—it was indeed the fact—that the great non-Christian religions, Buddhism among them, were declining. Now, however, they are, except for the old religions of China, very much reviving in the countries where they have long prevailed; and this is at least as true of Buddhism as it is of any other. Moreover, even religions, such as Hinduism, which formerly made no claim to be for the whole world, now in fact, if not in theory, are presented as faiths for the whole world. Naturally, Buddhism, which has always avowed that its teaching is for all men, irrespective of race, is more widely active even than in the past. There is pressure on Christians in such countries as Ceylon and Thailand to abandon Christianity in favour of Buddhism: and difficult problems arise as to how far Churchpeople can go in celebrating, for example, the anniversary of the Buddha's birth.

And in the West there is not only increased interest in Buddhism—Mr Christmas Humphreys's Pelican on Buddhism sold, I gather, over a hundred thousand copies in its first edition—but an increasing number who profess to be Buddhists. Public meetings of the London Buddhist Society are well patronized, even when many meetings find it difficult to secure an audience.

More than ever, surely, Churchpeople should know something about the chief non-Christian faiths, and should know their faith and practice as they are now, and not only as they used to be, or perhaps may originally have been.

To judge at least from public meetings held by the "foreign missions" in London, Buddhism seems to make the chief appeal. Nor is the influence of Buddhism in Europe purely a modern phenomenon. We may discount what some have alleged to be the influence of Buddhism on the beginnings of Christianity. But it has been thought, not without reason, that the Greek idea of the Golden Mean may have come originally from Buddhism. Moreover, it seems that the present revival of Buddhism was largely initiated by such Westerners as Colonel Olcott and (though he never professed to be a Buddhist) Professor T. W. Rhys Davids.

Accordingly, it seems worth while to consider what is the appeal of Buddhism to modern man, whether in the East or the West.

In a number of cases, political motives of national feeling have led Asian Christians to revert to Buddhism. In Thailand, we are told, several hundred Christians have been converted to Buddhism from the conviction that national unity is more important than religion. In Burma, and much the same is true in Ceylon, nationalist leaders have in effect to profess to be devout Buddhists in order to gain popular support: so for example in Burma, Dr Baw Maw, formerly Chief Minister, who was baptized in childhood as a Christian, when he had become a prominent national figure, desiring apparently to

safeguard his position, declared that he had returned to the mother (Buddhist) Church. In Ceylon the slogan is often heard, "One Blood, One Soil, One Language, One Religion" (of course Buddhism). When Ceylon achieved partial self-government in 1931 under the Donoughmore scheme, the swing to Buddhism increased, and public leaders who had been Christians discovered, we are told, the merits of Buddhism: those who had always been Buddhist called them "Donoughmore Buddhists". And it seems to be a fact that in general in countries largely Buddhist it is now not so much Buddhism and its teaching which is emphasized, as the Buddhist community. Dr Emil Brunner concluded, after his recent stay in Japan, that the main motive for increased attendance at Buddhist festivals and ceremonies was a desire to participate in the traditions of Japan.[1] An Indian Anglican priest, indeed, told me that in his judgment the main impulse behind the Sixth General Council is political. But, whatever truth there may be in that, it would be a fatal error to conclude that the appeal of Buddhism in the world as a whole is purely, or even mainly, a political one. In some cases Christians in China have gone over to Buddhism out of a feeling that Christianity as they saw it was too pragmatic a thing, a matter of "drives" and "campaigns", and lacked a spirit of real religious devotion and a proper other-worldliness.

As for Western interest in Buddhism, Bishop S. Kulandran has expressed the opinion that Colonel Olcott became interested in Buddhism primarily because it was not Christianity. And probably this is to some extent true of not a few other Americans and Europeans. The exotic has its own appeal, especially for some types of people, some of whom may have been unfortunate in their experience of the Church (it is interesting to be told[2] that some Western Buddhists are disappointed when they go to nominally Buddhist countries and see how very imperfect are many professed adherents of the Buddha). The East does appeal because of its colour and supposed romance to some Europeans. Then, too, there is a type of person in Europe and America who feels weary of the restless activity of Western civilization, and who seeks peace and tranquillity, and thinks that Buddhism provides these. Others are disappointed and disillusioned with the results of modern science and of social progress in general.

Buddhism is an intensely individualistic way of life. Only a small percentage of English Buddhists, says Mr Christmas Humphreys,[3] join a Buddhist Society: thousands try to live the Buddhist life, often without their neighbours knowing anything about it. This religious individualism would seem to be an attraction at least to some individualistic Britons. And a study of English Buddhist magazines suggests that the Buddhist reverence for all forms of life, and reluctance to take life, may appeal to people already inclined to be sentimental over their animal pets.

Mr Christmas Humphreys, who has done so much for Buddhism

[1] *Ecumenical Press Service*, 3 February 1956.
[2] *The Wheel*, December 1938.
[3] *Buddhism*, p. 229.

in England, has also worked for unity among conflicting schools of Buddhism in Asia. He tells us that he was brought up in the Church of England: but when he found in the First World War that nations on opposite sides appealed to the same God for victory, and that bishops blessed the arms of war, he turned his thoughts elsewhere: later he read Coomaraswamy's book *Buddha and the Gospel of Buddhism*, and at once accepted its teaching as an attractive theory. One suspects that Mr Humphreys is typical of Western Buddhists in first finding some difficulty in Christianity and only after that being drawn to Buddhism.

The rich ceremonial worship of Buddhism as seen in the East does not seem in general to attract Westerners, nor does the Pure Land school with its teaching of salvation by faith in Amitabha. It is rather the ethical humanism of Southern (or Theravada) Buddhism, and of the Zen school, with its teaching of enlightenment by sudden intuition, which attract Europeans and Americans.

To a considerable degree it is the same features in Buddhism which attract modern man in West and East alike. For Buddhism, at least in the form which has spread to the West, is in practice a purely secular humanism. It points to man alone as the creator of his present life, and the sole designer of his destiny.[1] It claims to maintain no dogmas and to involve no medieval conceptions of faith.[2] It is perfectly rational, and so there could never conceivably be any conflict between it and science. It is practical and common sense, and combines religion and philosophy and science. Man should work out his own salvation: dependence on a Personal God is sheer laziness. Its adherents do not have to believe in Trinities and miracles. Indeed, in some countries, or at least some circles, the modern interest is not so much in Buddhism as a religion and a way of life as in it as a philosophy.

While some seem to be attracted by the abstruse metaphysics to be found in Buddhism, others are attracted, on the contrary, by what they regard as its simplicity and practicality, as a way of life not involving belief in questionable dogmas: it provides, it is said, a rational basis for ethics and insists on self-reliance.

Some are said to have grown weary of the limitations of the intellect and then to be attracted to the "Sudden Way" of self-enlightenment to be found, for instance, in the Ch'an or Zen sect of Buddhism.

Buddhists look to an historical figure as the founder of their religion, unlike Hindus: and the figure of Gautama is certainly a more attractive one than either Mohammed or even Confucius with his somewhat chilly formalism. The Buddha, while far from being an aggressive bigot, instead of remaining by himself in peaceful meditation, as he might have preferred, and, instead of waging war, went about offering to all and sundry his Teaching concerning the cause and cure of suffering and the secret of Enlightenment and the conquest of sorrow. His message was from the start for all who would

[1] *Buddhism*, p. 76.

[2] T'ai Hsü in *The Wheel*, August 1937.

receive it, without restriction of caste (a very revolutionary attitude in the India of those days) or race or nationality. C. H. A. Bennett, the first Englishman to become a Buddhist monk, who was ordained as a monk in 1902 in Burma, and was thenceforth known as Ananda Metteya, was first influenced to Buddhism by reading Sir Edwin Arnold's presentation of Gautama in *The Light of Asia*. This poem has also influenced many other English people to favour Buddhism: certainly no other book has been so influential in this respect. And it is arguable that Constantine is a less attractive figure than the first great Buddhist emperor, Asoka, who, among much else, established hospitals long before the Christian era began.

To some, Christianity appears to be harsh and bigoted, and Buddhism, on the contrary, to be gentle and tolerant. A Roman Catholic priest who became a Buddhist monk was first repelled from Christianity when in his parish work he met sincere good people whom he had to condemn according to the narrow rules of the Roman Church: he felt the cruelty of eternal damnation in hell to be inconsistent with the infinite love of a Father in heaven: and eventually he adhered to Buddhism as a system not based on faith and authority but on reason and evidence and practice.[1]

Buddhism, indeed, is a convenient meeting-ground for "secular" humanists of East and West. It provides a colourful and universal dress for what would otherwise be the drab and cold faith of but a few Western intellectuals. While Christianity may seem to offer either liberalism without devotion or devotion with obscurantism, Buddhism offers devotion without obscurantism and dogma, and a combination of reason and compassion.

The problem of suffering is a concern to many people, and indeed plainly admits of no easy and obvious solution. Some Westerners, and modern Orientals, are attracted by the Buddhist solution in terms of the law of Karma: and some modern Orientals see this as an argument in favour of Buddhism. The inequalities of birth and the rest are felt to be accounted for in the same way. Buddhism alone of all the great religions has faced and solved the problem of evil and suffering. Karma and Rebirth are a natural and reasonable answer to the apparent injustice of the daily round: man reaps what he has sown (the New Testament—Gal. 6. 7—is commonly quoted in support of this), and what he reaps, that he has sown. Quite apart from Buddhism and Hinduism, not a few Western thinkers have been led to accept the doctrine of Rebirth to explain the facts of the universe.

Mr Cyril Moore, well-known in the English literary world, and founder with Dr Cyril Joad of *The Countrygoer*, edited for a time *The Middle Way*: before his death he went to the East, with a view to taking the Robe, and entered the Order as Bhikkhu Kevelananda. He was, Mr Christmas Humphreys tells us, like so many Western Buddhists, brought into the Buddhist movement by the sight of suffering which his native faith could not explain. The presence of

[1] *The Wheel*, November 1938.

so much suffering in the world seems to some to be inconsistent with the existence of a personal and Almighty God: and they may in consequence take up Buddhism.

Buddhists lay immense stress on justice, and describe the Christian doctrine of the forgiveness of sins as immoral, or as absurd. The doctrine of Rebirth is more satisfactory than the Christian doctrine that the soul is "saved" or "damned" at death according as its deeds in one short life have been mainly good or evil. Buddhism is not based on any unproved assumptions, such as the Christian doctrines of a personal God and an immortal soul. It does not involve a patronizing and invidious choice by an extra-human power, whereby the individual "soul" is "saved" or "damned".[1]

Many feel that Buddhism teaches the "Middle Way" between extremes, and that it allows free and full inquiry: since belief in a permanent ego is the first fetter to be removed, it clearly does not end in a "bigger and better ego". Further, Buddhism does not use poetical imagery or emotional-metaphorical phrases, but is eminently literal and prosaic: it emphasizes not ecstatic feelings but clear thinking, and even its compassion is mind-based.[2] One European woman has been led to Buddhism by Japanese Flower Arranging and a consequent study of its meaning and philosophy.[3]

As the world becomes smaller and increasingly is a single community, more and more the need is felt of a basis for world peace and brotherhood. Not a few Asians, and Westerners also, impressed by what they regard as the moral collapse of the Christian nations, who have invented and used the atom-bomb, and have now invented the H-bomb, regard Christianity as in consequence discredited. Buddhism is felt to provide the needed basis and bond: its teaching of Compassion for all living things is what is needed in the world today. It is claimed[4] with some justification that no war has ever been fought in the cause of Buddhism, and further that this has never been spread by violence. And it is argued that Buddhism provides a purely rational basis for the brotherhood of man, a basis which involves no transcendental ideas in conflict with science and a modern outlook. Buddhism is best able to efface ancient prejudice, and work for and with the unity of the world.[5] It is selfishness which is at the root of all strife and war, and this is inevitable if we believe that there is a permanent self or soul, rather than that the conception of this is an illusion to be discarded with all possible speed: the believer must of necessity fight for self.[6]

There are, of course, answers to all this, answers which can be summed up by saying that the Church should both teach and practise the whole Christian Faith—no less. But it would be fatal not to

---

[1] C. Humphreys, *Buddhism*, p. 84.
[2] Ronald Fussell in *The Middle Way*, February 1956, p. 173.
[3] Stella Coe in *The Middle Way*, February 1956, p. 188.
[4] B. L. Broughton in *The Wheel*, January 1939.
[5] T'ai Hsü in *The Wheel*, August 1937.
[6] R. M. Roberts in *The Wheel*, January 1938.

realize the real appeal which Buddhism has to man in the twentieth century, both in the East and the West, and the grounds of this appeal.

G. Francis S. Gray.

A Religious Best-Seller

A book which has recently been made available to us in this country in an American translation[1] has already enjoyed elsewhere phenomenal popularity. It is a "life of Jesus" such as in the last hundred and fifty years there have been plenty of, but of which no other can seemingly have found as many readers so quickly. English is the fifteenth language into which the book has been translated. As for the original French, in the summer of last year it gained for its author a seat among the Forty Immortals of the French Academy. And no wonder! For in the ten years following its publication in 1945 it had gone into 501 editions. Yes, 501 editions!

Even though the so-called editions are in fact reprintings, and the number of copies reprinted at any one time is not disclosed, we may allow ourselves to be impressed. The sensation aroused by Renan's *Vie de Jésus* (1863) had not abated when I was a boy in Paris forty years and more after its publication. Yet, whereas Daniel-Rops's *Jésus en son Temps* went into 501 editions in ten years, the *Vie de Jésus* in the same period went into only fourteen.

Can we penetrate the secret of that wide appeal? Before the *Jesus,* Daniel-Rops wrote a study of the "People of the Bible", and although the translation that was issued here a few years ago seemed to pass unnoticed, in France that book, too, has been extremely popular. It is stated there to be in its 405th edition! On the first page is the striking statement:

> At Ur, in Shinar, local capital of the Lower Euphrates. four thousand years ago, a man named Abram received the visit of God, and unhesitatingly believed in the Word.

The *Jesus* finished, Daniel-Rops undertook a large-scale history of the Church, of which six volumes have appeared. They carry the history from the age of the apostles and martyrs down to the Counter-Reformation. The latest volume is listed as being in its 85th edition, the first in its 212th. Daniel-Rops did not become a popular historian of Christianity without previous literary practice. He had made a moderate name as novelist, essayist, and literary critic. But, plainly, it is with the kind of writing upon which he is now engaged that he has displayed the fullness of his gifts. What are they?

The first and perhaps dominant impression made upon the reader of the new translation is of a calm yet warm-hearted confidence that

---

[1] Daniel-Rops, *Jesus in His Time.* Translated from the French by R. W. Millar. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 30s. There are misprints, such as "counsel" for "council" and "proceed" for "precede", and on p. 47 a curious inversion, "In Him was the Light and the Light was the life of men".

the story unfolded will be accepted in the spirit it is told. The author says truly that it is not possible "to write a life of Christ in the same attitude of mind that one would write of Caesar or Napoleon". He means that in order to write about Christ a man has to be either with him or against him. Impartiality is bound to be stultifying. As Renan was helped by his natural eloquence and lyrical temperament, so he was hampered by his purpose, which was to disprove what most of his readers had, to begin with, accepted as true. Daniel-Rops has no such handicap. On the contrary, his expectation that every reader he has is equally submissive to the Church with himself gives him a preliminary advantage.

Few non-Romans will let themselves be put off by that expectation. They may even be amused by the unfailing assumption that the only serious challenge to Rome comes from rationalists or agnostics. There is no shadow of uncertainty about the tone in which we are told when the Gospels were composed, and no overt suspicion that anybody may disagree. We are assured, for example, that the Fourth Gospel was written at some time between A.D. 96 and A.D. 104; that the author was "the beloved disciple" of Chapter XXI. 24, and that it must thus consist of his direct recollections. The Epistle to the Hebrews is, of course, credited to the pen of St Paul. There is so much in the same vein that we can only smile on learning that M. André Siegfried, the French Protestant writer, took public exception to the book's reiteration of the Petrine claims.

A wider objection to any book that purports to record the "life of Jesus" is that it must be profane. It is the objection that the material is amenable neither to biographical nor to historical treatment. Yet Dean Farrar considered impossible "any final harmony of the Gospels", and the consideration did not deter him. Daniel-Rops is no less alive to "discrepancies" between one Gospel and another. He says, however, that they are no reason for suspecting "the *historical validity* of the Gospel narratives" (his italics). The statement only leaves us in the dark concerning what "historical validity" may be for him. He acknowledges that "the direct contemporaries of Jesus do not mention him". He acknowledges the notorious "silence of Josephus". But, on the other hand, he says nothing of the case which there is, as we all know, for holding that Jesus nevertheless lived and died. No doubt it was not within his design for the case as such to be presented once again; he might, in the sixty-four pages he devotes to the materials we have to go on, have asserted its existence categorically. Instead, he ends by saying that the "historical validity" of the Gospel narratives "really rests upon interior knowledge". Not only does the very expression beg a further question, but also the statement runs contrary to what many of both the clergy and the laity suppose.

However, it is not by the communication of "interior knowledge" that the book exercises attraction. Rather it does so owing to the author's power to stimulate the reader's imagination. He says of Jesus, for instance, "He could be seen walking along a road that is still pointed out to us." That is undoubtedly effective. The indis-

putable reality of the road passes across to the figure that "could be seen". As another instance, there is his telling us that Mary's precious ointment (Matt. 26. 6-13) was made "with the essence of the soft brown moss" which grows like fur in the hollows of the Palestinian rocks. As did just now the figure that "could be seen", so now not merely the ointment, but also the pouring of it upon Jesus's head borrow some reality. By these and many other touches of circumstantial detail the human Jesus steadily grows in substance. The danger is that it will be at the expense of his divinity.

Not only are there the two natures established by conciliar decision, but they are inseparable. Hence, let the account of the Virgin Birth, of the Forty Days in the Wilderness, of the Transfiguration, of the miracles, and of the Forty Days after the Resurrection, be as matter-of-fact and as straightforward as you please, and it will all be in vain if the biographer fails to exorcise the temptation to humanize ever more and more; for the humanizing must damage the reader's susceptibility to the marvellous.

On this occasion, not only are we told of the clothing Jesus wore and of the food he ate, but we are also treated to a disquisition on the extent and quality of his education, on what languages he spoke, and on his intellectual equipment. It is an easy illusion that we are thereby learning something. At this point Daniel-Rops refers to Matt. 8. 22: "Let the dead bury their dead." I remember I once asked Hoskyns if he could help me to understand the saying. He did not reply. Daniel-Rops brings it up while dealing with the language which Jesus spoke. He suggests that here Jesus was making in Aramaic a pun. "Jesus," he says, "was probably making use of the resemblance between *matha* (the people of the village) and *metha* (the dead)." That is to put us off too obviously. We ask, "What use?" I prefer Hoskyns's silence.

Nor is that all. Daniel-Rops expressly tells us that all the fathers, from Irenaeus of Lyons onwards, have insisted that "the face of Jesus in the flesh is unknown to us". As regards "the character and temperament" of Jesus, the Gospels are, he says, "curiously elusive". It is odd that he does not leave the matter at that. But no, he is at pains to assert that "the personality of Jesus is not only manifestly sincere; it is unshakeable". He assures us, concerning Jesus, that "the perfection of his human character" lies in "the union and balance of the three qualities—sincerity, firmness, and authority". I should explain that he is anxious to reassure French Roman Catholics on the score of the allegation made by a succession of psychologists in the last sixty or seventy years, and chiefly in France. It is the allegation that has been read into the words reported in Mark 6. 3, that Jesus was mad. He does not dispose of it, however, by counter-assertions equally gratuitous, especially as there is a simple and yet final answer to it.

"A psychology of Jesus is an impossibility," remarks a Roman Catholic theologian of international repute, the German, Mgr Romano Guardini. He remarks this in the preface to his well-known commentary upon the Gospels and the Book of Revelation, a commentary which, like the book by Daniel-Rops, has now been made

available to English readers—in a translation even more markedly American.[1]

> A psychology of Jesus is an impossibility. . . . Anyone who attempts to overstep the obvious limitations only loses sight of the authentic figure. . . . All one can do is demonstrate from ever new points of departure how all attributes, all characteristics of Christ, terminate in the incomprehensible, an incomprehensibility, however, of measureless promise.

It might be thought that the truth thus enunciated was self-evident. Daniel-Rops does not seem to have perceived it. Otherwise he would hardly endow Jesus with "Messianic consciousness" or write: "We may imagine the divinity of Jesus as a force of which he, the man, was fully aware, which sustained and lifted him beyond himself in the great undertakings of his mission." I don't mind saying that whoever thinks he can imagine anything of the kind deceives himself.

But although it is Mgr Guardini who utters the above pertinent truth, I do not feel that his book is the better piece of work. His intentions, needless to say, are admirable. He avoids both chronological order and logical sequence. Rather he selects "for thought" items of the Lord's teaching, events, and miracles, as each "happens to warm to life", and gives us a "meditation", as he calls it, upon each in itself.

I confess that the Revelation of St John is a part of the Bible that has always somewhat repelled me, and it was with fresh hope that in Mgr Guardini's book, after the "meditations" which he devotes to the Resurrection and subsequent appearances of the risen Jesus, I came upon a final set of twelve chapters about it. In these chapters he at first makes no effort to interpret the symbolism, but seems to take it as being incidental, and it is only pieces of it that are relevant to his context that he elucidates in the course of expounding the eschatology. Upon this procedure I placed expectations. Naturally, the imagery has later to occupy the forefront of discussion, but he goes on striving to put his exegesis into terms of today.

Yet by and by the promise at first held out by that section of the book began to fade. After I had excitedly read the references to the appearance of the dragon and of the first apocalyptic beast, to the final defeat of Satan, and to "heaven and earth fled away", I had a sensation of anti-climax on learning that I was simply beholding "the Christian conception of history", and that "for Revelation, the sense of history lies in the fulfilment of salvation". Much earlier in the book, following the exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount, I thought I had come upon something arresting. It was the following passage:[2]

> I am not referring to the limitations of the Church: to her indolence, intolerance, tyranny, narrowness, or to any other form of evil that might be present in her. All these are simply improper, and we shall have to answer for them before God. No. Here I wish to point out the specific task that the Church has been given to fulfil: to reconcile Christ's demands (which seem to exceed human strength) with man's present possibilities; to create a pass, a bridge between them; to come to our aid.

[1] Romano Guardini, *The Lord*. Translated from the German by Elinor Castendyk. Longmans. 28s. There is no index. The passage quoted is from p. 5.
[2] Op. cit., p. 96.

Alas, I was being led up the garden path! Thunder without lightning! The stirring words are the preface to no more than an assurance that God himself will fill the gap and build the bridge, for he is the God of Love. I prefer Luther on the *Scala santa*!

The advantage of taking a glance at Mgr Guardini's book in the midst of considering the best-seller by Daniel-Rops is, indeed, that, different as the two are, I am helped to appreciate, by contrast, the solid qualities of *Jésus en son Temps*. Daniel-Rops is the Daedalus to Mgr Guardini's Icarus. He does not fly too high. About, say, the Forty Days in the Wilderness he ventures no theories—neither theories too ingenious nor theories too trite; he is content to make the comfortless landscape of the wilderness visible. The Evangelists seem very confident on this occasion that they know all that went on. How did they learn of it? The question is natural, and he answers it as far as he is able. He refers us to the apocryphal Gospel of the Ebionites.

He mentions Renan's saying that the Holy Land formed a Fifth Gospel. He himself feels that of more compelling interest than the geographical background—vividly as he supplies this—is the "human setting". He means, he says, written testimony, and the results of archaeological research. It is in this element of his book that the experience he gained in writing his earlier "People of the Bible" stands him in good stead.

The sure way of indicating his quality will be to take his treatment of the first miracle—that of Cana. He begins with a brief description of the village which now stands on one of the two rival sites associated by archaeologists with the event. He next points to the view which a traveller would gaze upon if he turned while climbing from Bethsaida—the wide blue estuary of the Jordan, the reflected snows of Hermon, the flying flamingoes in the spring. A brief account of some customs at Jewish wedding feasts then completes the prefatory matter. The words of the Johannine Gospel are quoted, and immediately after we are given the comment of Aliosha in *The Brothers Karamazov*: "The first, the kind miracle, when Christ joins in human happiness, happiness and not sorrow." By way of comment. Daniel-Rops then says that the family at Cana was substantial, but he is sure that the painters who have depicted "the rustic revels in sumptuous surroundings" are mistaken. He then recalls St Augustine's view that this miracle symbolizes "the operation of a higher order", and finally he alludes to the mysterious significance bestowed upon other recorded changes of water into wine.

In sum, the view which the book offers of the earthly life of our Lord is not so much one through a telescope nearly two thousand years long as one across the variegated expanse of European history, European literature and European art—an expanse studded with innumerable mementoes of the reactions of great men to the good news of the Redemption. The standpoint at which Daniel-Rops would place us is the diametrical opposite of that which Kierkegaard considers essential when he calls upon men to try to become "con-

temporary with the coming of Christianity into the world".[1] But it implies no rejection of Kierkegaard to feel that such a standpoint, connecting as it does our own faith with the faith of our ancestors, has its value.

Regarding the Crucifixion, Mgr Guardini dwells on the question: "Why did Jesus die?" He asks the meaning of the term "redeemed". He speaks of "the illimitable flame of the omnipresent agony", and of the utter helplessness and hopelessness of the end. He does not succeed in making us see and feel to the extent Daniel-Rops does. The latter compares crucifixion with some other forms of executing "what mankind calls a just sentence"; he says that it was a Roman and not a Jewish punishment; he explains in detail how cruel and frightful it was, and exactly how it was carried out.

The difference between the two treatments of the Resurrection is a similar one. Mgr Guardini says:[2]

> We do not say: The dead do not return to life. Therefore the Resurrection is a myth. We say: Christ rose again. Therefore resurrection is possible, and his Resurrection is the foundation of the true world.

We may notice there two things. The point made is familiar, and a *non sequitur* has now crept into the making of it. Danie-Rops steers clear of the deeper waters. He quotes the Gospel of Nicodemus and the Gospel of Peter. He offers an explanation of the little space which the events that followed the Resurrection occupy in the Synoptic Gospels. He says that, for the Evangelists, the events "were in no way different from those of the daily life of Jesus in the past". But he must not be misunderstood. He also recalls that the Church teaches, even as the Gospel makes clear, "that the circumstances of the life of Jesus after his resurrection were not the same as those of his previous life among men". When he refers to the attempts of rationalists and agnostics "to get rid of the Resurrection", there is one matter about which he is very firm. He says that unless the fact is denied, and the accounts rejected, the word "resurrection" must be taken to mean a rising from the dead, and nothing else. It cannot, for instance, be made to mean visions.

Mgr Guardini is passionate, theological, and abstract.[3] Daniel-Rops is concrete and human; above all, he is serene. Hence his book is simple, direct, and absorbing to read. We can understand its success, and we can believe that by means of this particular best-seller he has done, and is doing, good.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

---

[1] Søren Kierkegaard, *On Authority and Revelation*, translated by Walter Lowrie (Princeton, 1955), p. 59. "Contemporaneousness" in this sense is of course the sole subject of the earlier book, *Training in Christianity*.

[2] Op. cit., p. 407.

[3] I am assured that his *Der Dämonie der Macht* and his *Das Ende der Neuzeit* are much better books than *The Lord*.

Johannine Commentaries

RECENTLY there has been a steady flow of books on the Fourth Gospel. In this discussion we shall be concerned principally with Mr Barrett's commentary on the Gospel,[1] with which will be taken his revision of the late Dr Howard's book on the Fourth Gospel.[2] Professor Schnackenburg's *Die Johannesbriefe*[3] will also be noticed.

Mr Barrett's commentary has been expected for some years (the manuscript was completed at the end of 1951), and it comes up to expectation. In form it contains nothing revolutionary, but will be all the more serviceable for that.

The introduction deals with the topics one hopes to find there. "The Problem of the Fourth Gospel", "Literary Characteristics and Structure", "Sources", "Theories of Displacement and Redaction"; these are headings of the first chapter on "The Gospel, its Characteristics and Purpose". The next chapters, "The Non-Christian Background of the Gospel" and "The Christian Background of the Gospel", touch the crux of interpretation. Mr Barrett is sympathetic to comparisons with the *Hermetica*. He writes, "No direct literary relationship can be traced, but it seems clear that John was working with similar presuppositions and along similar lines to those of the Hermetic authors" (page 31), and concludes: "The most illuminating background of the fourth gospel is that of Hellenistic Judaism" (33). His commentary was completed too early for him to use the Dead Sea texts with confidence.

Next comes a useful chapter, "The Theology of the Gospel". It treats of "Eschatology", "Christology", "Miracles", "Salvation", "Sacraments", "Mysticism", "The Holy Spirit: The Trinity", "The Church and its Life". Mr Barrett says little of the influence of this Gospel on the doctrine of the Ancient Church after the second century. He mentions its importance as laying "the foundations for a doctrine of a co-equal Trinity" (78). He does not, however, refer to the importance of John for the Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. It would be interesting to have him discuss why the Monophysites found John so useful.

The following chapter, "The Origin and Authority of the Gospel", treats of authorship, date, place of origin. Mr Barrett gives a fair review of the evidence and then proceeds to his conclusions. One or two details in his argument call for second thoughts.

After referring to the Rylands and the Egerton papyri, Mr Barrett writes: "These two papyri were both discovered in Egypt, and it is possible to feel confident that John was known there at least ten or twenty years before the middle of the second century" (92 f.). Let us consider this statement in the light of what we do know and do not know. We know that P. Rylands 457 may be dated between the end of the first century and the middle of the second century A.D., and

[1] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St John*, 1955, S.P.C.K., 63s.
[2] W. F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. Revised by C. K. Barrett, 1955, Epworth Press, 16s.
[3] R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe*, 1953, Herder, DM. 22.

P. Egerton 2 about the middle of the second century, and that both papyri were found in the twentieth century. We do not know where they were written, nor when they were first in Egypt, nor when they were discarded. They might, for example, have been written in Rome, have reached Alexandria in the third century, and arrived about A.D. 300 at the area in which they were found. Precision on these points is important, as those who hold that the Gospel was written in Egypt make great play with the fact that these two early papyri were found there.

Mr Barrett puts P. Rylands 457 "not later than A.D. 150" and perhaps "some years earlier". This does not represent the conclusions of the papyrologists clearly enough. Deissmann suggested that the papyrus belonged to the reign of Hadrian, and Wilcken held that, as far as palaeography was concerned, it might be contemporary with the Apollonius archive (A.D. 117–120).[1] In view of these opinions, we might consider A.D. c. 130 as a reasonable possibility within the broad limits given above.

These considerations favour a revision of the dates Mr Barrett proposes. He suggests that the Gospel was not written before A.D. 90, and not published after A.D. 140. (We may note, by the way, that Mr Barrett distinguishes between writing the book and publishing it.) In view of what has been said about the date of P. Rylands 457, A.D. 140 seems much too late for the lower limit of publication. A.D. 120 would seem more likely. Indeed, the further after A.D. 100 we advance our lower limit, the more improbable it appears.

According to Mr Barrett, "it cannot be said that the case for Alexandria has been made out" (100). He could have come out even more firmly against this suggestion. As far as Christianity is concerned, Egypt before Irenaeus' time is a void, and scholars have sought to fill this void with hypotheses like air rushing into a vacuum. As we saw with P. Rylands 457 and P. Egerton 2, they have drawn conclusions from the evidence that the evidence does not warrant. We probably know very little about Christianity in Egypt before A.D. c. 160 because there was very little Christianity there at that time to know anything about.

Ephesus seems the most likely place of origin for the Gospel, and Mr Barrett connects this probability with the traditions about authorship. His basic statement is: "The crux of the problem of the origin of John lies in (i) the moral certainty that the gospel was not written by John the son of Zebedee; (ii) the probability that the tradition (which seems to begin as early as 21. 24) that the gospel was written by John the son of Zebedee, interested as it doubtless was, was not pure fiction but had some foundation" (112). It is best to give his conclusion in full: "John the Apostle migrated from Palestine and lived in Ephesus, where, true to character as a Son of Thunder, he composed apocalyptic works. These, together with his advancing years, the death of other apostles, and predictions such as Mark 9. 1, not unnaturally gave rise to the common belief that he

[1] C. H. Roberts, *The Rylands Papyri*, iii. 1 f. (1938).

would survive to the parousia. A man of commanding influence, he gathered about him a number of pupils. In course of time he died; his death fanned the apocalyptic hopes of some, scandalized others, and induced a few to ponder deeply over the meaning of Christian eschatology. One pupil of the apostle incorporated his written works in the canonical Apocalypse; this was at a date about the close of the life of Domitian—A.D. c. 96. Another pupil was responsible for the epistles (possibly 1 John came from one writer, 2 and 3 John from another). Yet another, a bolder thinker, and one more widely read both in Judaism and Hellenism, produced John 1–20. Comparison with 1, 2 and 3 John shows at once that the evangelist stood apart from the busy and quarrelsome ecclesiastical life of the age. Probably he was not popular; probably he died with his gospel still unpublished. It was too original and daring a work for official backing. It was first seized upon by gnostic speculators, who saw the superficial contact which existed between it and their own work; they at least could recognize the language John spoke. Only gradually did the main body of the Church come to perceive that, while John used (at times) the language of gnosticism, his work was in fact the strongest reply to the gnostic challenge; that he had beaten the gnostics with their own weapons and vindicated the permanent validity of the primitive Gospel. The gospel was now edited together with ch. 21; the narratives of the final chapter were probably based on traditional material; perhaps material which the evangelist had left but had not worked into the main body of his work." (113 f.) Whatever we may think of this reconstruction, it does work within the terms of reference that Mr Barrett has given himself. It is doubtful whether more can be done along these lines.

Mr Barrett makes several sound judgments by the way. He will have nothing to do with any theory of displacements, and we can only agree with him. The theories of accidental displacements are mechanically improbable, and those which require deliberate rearrangement in the manner of Dr Bultmann seem more unconvincing the more one examines them. R. H. Lightfoot's posthumous volume supports Mr Barrett here.

The introduction deals briefly with the historicity of the Gospel. It was not the evangelist's "intention to write a work of scientific history" (117). On the other hand, he cannot be accused of having "freely created narration material for allegorical purposes" (117). Thus "John presents in his one book both history and interpretation. The result is not a biography; it is impressionistic rather than photographically accurate in detail, but it cannot be denied that the total effect is impressive and illuminating" (118). This is a position corresponding to A. E. Housman's "betwixt and between", and its prudence is clear from the present state of research.

Mr Barrett treats of the purpose of the Gospel. He quite fairly does not pretend to tell us more than our studies warrant. He does, however, connect the book with "two urgent problems" of the years A.D. c. 100, the problem of eschatology and that of gnosticism. Linked with these problems is the question, for whom the Gospel was

intended. It cannot be said that he shows himself sympathetic to the suggestion that the Gospel was written to convert a pagan public.

Theories of an Aramaic original are discounted. There is an Aramaic background to the Gospel, but it cannot be proved that it is immediately behind the Gospel. The evangelist seemingly "was accustomed to think and to speak in Aramaic as well as in Greek". In discussing attempts to recover the Aramaic behind particular passages in the Gospel, Mr Barrett shows a proper caution.

Much has been written about the language of John. Some studies have been of great value and many significant features have been indicated; but we still lack any adequate inventory of the syntax and style. Until such an inventory has been made, it is doubtful whether we can assess the Semitic influence on the idiom of the Gospel or profit from language as an aid to exegesis to the extent that this is possible, for example, in Mark.

The last chapter in the introduction deals briefly with text. The text of the Gospel provides fewer problems than some other New Testament books, and has suffered relatively little in transmission. This may be due partly to its late date. Many of the conclusions in the commentary about textual variations seem sound. It rightly favours the longer text at 4. 9, and the shorter at 6. 23. It is inclined to omit 12. 8. If the verse is original, it is hard to explain its absence from D sy^s. If the shorter text is right, the additions of the verse can be explained from Mark 14. 7, Matt. 26. 11. Mr Barrett is rightly reserved about the conjecture ὄσσῳ at 19. 29. Its superficial plausibility does not stand inspection in the light of John's vocabulary and the use of the word elsewhere.

The commentary itself has much useful material. There are many sensible discussions, such as that of ἐμβριμᾶσθαι 11. 33 (332 f.). Difficulties are not shirked and the judgments are usually sound.

If we consider the economy of the commentary, certain conclusions can be reached with the aid of a comparison. Hoskyns's work was directed primarily not to the creation of a reference book, but to the putting forward of a view about the Gospel and its meaning in the form of a commentary. It is true that concessions were made to the normal commentary form with occasional details about text and language, but relatively few references are given and the book presents mainly a theological interpretation.

On the other hand, Dr Vincent Taylor's Mark is a work of reference. There is a considerable contribution from its author, but this occupies an inconspicuous place in the mass of material which forms the common stock of a good commentary. We have many precise references and we are usually told where we can find the principal discussions of any particular point at issue.

Mr Barrett's commentary belongs to the same kind as that of Dr Vincent Taylor. It is a work of reference rather than a vehicle for a particular view or thesis about the Gospel. In the main the commentary on John is successful in achieving this end.

In one particular only it is not so successful. In a commentary which is primarily a vehicle of a particular point of view, a lack of

references is no great handicap. In a commentary which is bound to be a work of reference it is. For example, we have a reference (75) to the view, among others, of Windisch about the Paraclete sayings. We have no mention of Windisch's name nor a reference whereby the statement of his views can be found.[1]

Another difficulty is inherent in this economy. The commentary is no mere collection of other men's views. Careful study reveals that Mr Barrett has made a considerable contribution himself to the exposition of John, but his reserve of references makes it even harder to detect his share. It will be obvious, of course, that the conclusions and the end of the discussions are Mr Barrett's own, but he is responsible for much more than this.

We hope that Mr Barrett's book will go at any rate into a second edition. It might be difficult or undesirable to increase the size of the book by adding references. Cuts, however, may be made possible by jettisoning here and there some minor superfluities. We could have been spared the reference on the spelling of ἐραννᾶν at 5. 39 (222). It does not advance the argument or the exposition. Other such excisions would give room for valuable references.

Mr Barrett gives in his introduction over a page on vocabulary. It is either too large or too small. If Mr Barrett intended parts of his argument to turn on vocabulary (and I do not believe he does), it is too small. If he felt that a conventional commentary should in any case have a section on vocabulary, there is a case for breaking with convention, and we hope that Mr Barrett will feel encouraged to do so.

These remarks are not intended to suggest that the study of the Johannine vocabulary has no bearing on an interpretation of the Gospel. Far from it. It is, for example, relevant to our inquiry into the background of the Gospel. Thus of about 920 words in its vocabulary, 900 recur in the Greek Bible, or in related texts like the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. A comparative study of the relation of the vocabulary of the Gospel to that of the *Hermetica* or of Philo would be interesting and relevant.

Just now and then in his treatment of the theology of the Gospel Mr Barrett has not quite got home. John 6 has long been a centre of controversy. What does it all mean? Various interpretations have been advanced, but in reading the commentary we might get the feeling that all was plain sailing and that if there were disagreements about the meaning, they were minor ones.

Nor are we helped to realize how far away the Gospel teaching is from our outlook today. Granted that in John 6 there are references to the Eucharist, we must realize that the evangelist probably did not view the Eucharist as we do. Thus, while Hebrews has a sacrificial theme which (apart from 13. 10) is unrelated to the Eucharist, John 6 has a Eucharistic theme which (with the doubtful exception of 6. 51) is not discussed in terms of sacrifice. From this it is clear that

[1] Cf. *Festgabe für Jülicher*, 110–37, "Die fünf Johanneischen Paraklet-sprüche".

some New Testament writings, and John among them, did not associate Eucharist and sacrifice in the way that we do. We would not, however, realize from the Commentary how far the Gospel is from us in this instance.

In writing this commentary, Mr Barrett was not able to refer to C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, as it appeared too late for his purpose. He has made this good in a new chapter in his revision of Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation*. In this edition he has added two chapters on the "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 1931–1953" and the "Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, 1931–1953". They contain, among other things, useful discussions on the views of Hoskyns, Bultmann and Dodd.

A commentator has to consider the place of the work on which he comments in kindred literature. For Mr Barrett the Johannine Epistles, despite many features shared with the Gospel, do not seem to be by the same author. "The writer of the Epistle was a man of less profound mind than the evangelist," though there is "a close connection between epistle and gospel, but exactly what this relation is can now only be guessed."

Professor Schnackenburg, in his commentary on the Johannine Epistles, does not regard the difference between the Gospel and the Epistles as sufficient to require different authors for these works. He is supported by Howard, among others, though Dodd still regards these works as being from different authors. In the main, Dr Schnackenburg's discussion is very fair to the debate, though he shows himself a little less conscious of the significance of the differences between Epistle and Gospel than Mr Barrett does.

Dr Schnackenburg's commentary as a whole is a commendable work. It is clear, well arranged, and balanced. The introduction deals with the various points adequately, and the commentator's conclusions are always well argued. Full attention is given to the theology of the documents. It is interesting that two commentaries produced in such different traditions should show the same virtues as do those produced by Dr Schnackenburg and Mr Barrett.

It is to be hoped that none of what has been written here will be regarded as obscuring the merit of Mr Barrett's work. It is written in a clear, easy, and workmanlike style, and there is nothing pretentious about it. When we consider the commentary as a whole, it is just the kind of work a commentary ought to be, and is sure to prove a standby for students at various levels for many years. The volume is well produced and carefully printed. Misprints and slips are few and far between. We can quarrel only with the cost, and that is a matter which we hope success will remedy.

G. D. Kilpatrick.

On Hearing Sermons

I will first state as simply as possible the problem under review. There is no lack of preaching in the British Isles. Thousands of

sermons are preached every Sunday. But how many of these sermons do the listeners really take in? How can we explain the odd Biblical interpretations and strong religious prejudices, so widely held, if not by the failure of sermons to register? If we think back to the last sermon *we* heard, how much of it can *we* remember? My doctor, I'm sure, was speaking for many when he confessed that, although he may have listened, as he thought, attentively to a sermon, he can rarely reproduce the argument when he arrives home half an hour afterwards.

This reaction from the doctor is a most useful reaction to have. For emphatically the problem of preaching calls for the co-operation of *all* Christian people, not only the clergy, but also the laymen at the receiving end. Pater Alfred Delp, the Jesuit who was executed for opposing Hitler, once advised the laity to take a more constructive attitude towards their priests: "You must not call black white and white black just because a person is a priest. It is up to you to help these men to be better. Keep your eyes (and, we might add, your ears) open and speak up, not in cheap criticism, but out of a sense of your own responsibility for the Church." Too often the sermon is preached, and the congregation depart, without the preacher having any means of knowing whether he has been in the target area at all.

There is indeed ground for thinking that our whole system of preaching may be in need of overhaul; that the clergy of the Church of England are being consistently over-preached, and are being driven by the remorseless demands of two sermons a Sunday, year in, year out, *either* to curtail other important work *or* to lower their preaching standards. With the increasing shortage of man-power, this may soon have to be faced at the highest level, and perhaps definite measures will have to be taken. First, an Order of Preachers might be inaugurated—outstanding men, whose duty it would be to travel round and reinforce the whole teaching mission of the Church. The Religious Communities, of course, do help in this way, but we need many more preachers than they can supply. Secondly, there might be greater interchange of pulpits—to ensure that there should be one Sunday in every month for which parochial clergy did not have to prepare new sermons. Congregations, we believe, welcome a visiting preacher: it is the clergy themselves who are often reluctant to issue and accept invitations to preach. Thirdly, greater use should almost certainly be made of laymen, whose personal testimony is always impressive.

But such measures are outside our present scope, and we must now concentrate on the underlying psychological considerations involved in speaking and listening. For the burden of this paper is that the methods of presentation commonly used are ineffective to a large degree because people underestimate the difficulty of taking in the spoken word.

In listening to a person talk there are two processes which come into play. The first is *attention*. We hear the sounds that reach our ears. We hear words and sentences which form sound patterns. But attention is preparatory to *perception*. We have still to penetrate

behind the words to the meaning which the speaker is trying to put across. Attention brings us, so to speak, into the presence of certain facts; perception consists in grasping and knowing the facts. Let us consider these two processes in turn.

An audience, absorbed in a speech, gives a good picture of the general attentive attitude. We notice that most people look fixedly towards the speaker, and that many of them lean forwards, as if it were important to get as close as possible. All the little restless movements cease, and at the tensest moments even the breath is checked. But the motor response of attention includes more than the immobile attitude of readiness. It includes also responses of a mobile and shifting type, involving special adjustments of the sense organs. Attention is no mere passive activity. Psychologists have noted three stages through which our attention passes.

(*a*) First comes the random sort of attention, excited by novelty. To catch attention of this sort is, of course, the chief concern of advertisers.

(*b*) Next comes the stage of forced attention, while overcoming distractions. The worst distractions are internal distractions. A person who has something on his mind, or something he would much prefer to be doing, is the most distractible person there is. There is the further difficulty that, in daily life, everyone learns how *not* to attend just as much as how to attend. We all learn *not* to notice marginal stimuli that are unimportant to us, or we couldn't drive a car through traffic. Finally, of course, there are those powerful stimuli which we cannot ignore. An experiment has been made in America by an investigator, playing beautiful music and telling humorous anecdotes, while sixteen students were engaged in adding, learning by heart, and solving riddles. All sixteen, not unnaturally, showed some loss of output, ranging from 8 per cent. to over 50 per cent. They sometimes lost track of the task altogether, and gave themselves up for the time to the story or the music. At other times they fought off the distraction by a great expenditure of muscular energy. This experiment would seem to be interesting for two reasons. First, it reproduces accurately the conditions under which owners of radio and television sets live. And Dr Jung claims that such distractions in the home have more than a passing effect. They are irreparably undermining our powers of concentration. Secondly, it proves that, if we are to overcome such distractions, we have to throw increased energy into our task. That is why, after *listening* to a speech, we sometimes feel utterly exhausted.

(*c*) Finally arrives the stage of objective interest. For, as we all know, the ideal sustainer of attention is an interest in the subject. In the advertising world it is recognized that, more important than mechanical devices, is the appeal to the habitual or temporary interests of the reader. If a man is hunting for a job, even a "little ad." will catch his eye. And this leads us to the second process involved.

People, held by interest, are those most likely to become really perceptive. Aldous Huxley gives the reason for this when he writes: "The mind is obviously not a box with compartments, into which

new ideas can be introduced by merely opening the lid. The mind is an organism: it is alive and must be nourished. And nourishment is best absorbed by an organism that feeds with appetite." In short, if a speaker cannot stimulate and sustain a live and vivid interest, it is a complete waste of time his talking at all.

One last observation about sustaining interest. Perception is also helped if the elements to be perceived can be easily grouped together and united into a pattern. In his book on Psychology, Professor R. S. Woodworth has been describing how some speakers, planning out a speech, locate each successive "point" in a corner of the hall, or in a room of their own house; and when they have finished one "point", look into the next corner, or think of the next room, and find the following "point" there. "But," he adds by way of criticism, "it would seem that *a well-constructed speech should supply its own logical clues,* so that artificial and arbitrary aids of this sort would be superfluous."

Now when we come to apply these psychological considerations to the special problem of preaching, we are anxious not to overstate our case. It is not suggested for one moment that scientific technique alone can ensure the effectiveness of a sermon, and more will be said about this at the end. Nor do the following recommendations apply equally to all types of sermon—not so much, for instance, to ethical, evangelistic, and devotional types, which depend largely on releasing people's emotions. But they do apply, in our belief, most vitally to all types of teaching sermon, whether doctrinal, apologetic, or Biblical. For in the past the deficiencies of the pulpit, *for the purpose of teaching,* have not been sufficiently recognized. There are no visual aids. The congregation takes no notes. Not even a sermon outline is provided in the pews, which they might follow and take home with them.

Moreover, it came clearly out of the Mission to London that the language of the nineteenth-century evangelism is no longer a language "understanded of the people". Roman Catholics are up against the same problem at the other extreme. "It is tragic," writes Fr Gerald Vann, "that we should find ourselves still bogged down in an ecclesiastical jargon which becomes more and more meaningless as the years go by, and which hides the great realities of faith and worship under a mass of unreal verbiage." The crying need of our age is to teach dogma in new and undogmatic terms. During the preparation of this paper, members of a branch of Toc H—a fair cross-section of male Christian opinion of different denominations—were asked to give their personal reactions to present-day preaching. Here are three out of a number of outspoken but instructive replies:

> "Parsons need to learn more about marketing their products."
> "When we go, we only hear a lot of out-of-date history."
> "We want more relevance."

The question of relevance is vital to the stimulating of interest. Listeners may vary considerably in towns and villages, in their occupations and mental calibre. But wherever they are it is safe to say

they are living their working lives at a surface level. The newspapers they read, the films they see are purely secular in outlook. There is, moreover, as G. N. M. Tyrrell has pointed out, an instinct in all of us which urges us to reject the unfamiliar and inexplicable, whatever the evidence in its favour may be. When we are faced, for instance, with the sudden death of a person who was close to us, our first reaction is one of blank incredulity. We refuse to believe it. It must be some mistake. A telephone message will put it right. It is too shattering all at once to the mental security we have built round ourselves. This is the hand of nature keeping us adjusted to our normal environment, and it becomes a great sanction for materialism.

The preacher, therefore, has to make allowance for this if he is to be thought relevant and not up-in-the-clouds. He has to start where people are and then lead them on from the shelter of the familiar to see that life is more than it seems; and so to turn their affections from the things that change and pass to things that have the quality of eternity.

In this connexion may we say this about the use of Holy Scripture? The "content and criterion of preaching" is always the revelation of God in the Bible. But this does not mean that a number of parallel texts have only to be threaded together and the preacher's task is done. Such a view of preaching has too long been taken in some circles as a substitute for proper preparation. Of course the text is the most vital part of the sermon: but it has to be most carefully prepared for, and fitted in at the most telling moment, as a man fits the last piece into a jigsaw, making the whole picture come together and have meaning. And this brings us to the subject of construction.

Second only to relevance is the importance of construction. Of so many sermons it can be said that the material is there, but it is muddled and badly presented. It needs to be cut down and rearranged. When a trainee scriptwriter takes his story to an experienced editor, he will receive such comments as these: "It doesn't jell"—it doesn't come together as a whole. "It's opening a can of peas"—suddenly introducing a quite new set of ideas. "It's hat-reaching"—giving away the climax too early, so there's nothing more to stay for. The whole art, in a screenplay of nine reels, is to hold the climax till the eighth reel. This approximates to the lowest point of our attention. The Army, in training recruits, have proved this experimentally, and brought out a graph which shows that in a forty-minute period, our attention drops to its lowest ebb about the thirtieth minute. About ten minutes from the end, therefore, one major used to let off a blank cartridge to wake everyone up!

Ideally, in a sermon also, we need to have something to take the place of the cartridge. Illustrations and stories are what people find easy to listen to and remember—the reason why Christ taught in parables—and, provided they are good, illustrations and stories may be profitably reserved till near the end.

Finally we submit that well-meaning requests for longer sermons are quite out of keeping with present-day needs. Style reflects the age. The leisurely periods of the Victorians have given place to the slick,

terse sentences of the radio commentators. One good proposition, correctly built to, is enough. There is some hope then that the congregation will retain the point of the argument, whereas, if offered four propositions, they will retain no point at all. This is no counsel of idleness. Quite the contrary. As Emile Chartier said, "It takes time to be short."

To sum up, therefore, our psychological considerations suggest certain practical details.

(1) A preacher must not be deluded by the initial stillness into thinking that his congregation are necessarily listening. They may be attending to his gestures or expression and not listening to his words. A good opening is essential. The recent collection of Sermon Outlines, called *The Word of God in the Life of Man*, begins one sermon with the words "Today is Whit-Sunday"—an opening surely guaranteed to lose attention in record time.

(2) If attention depends to some extent on the expenditure of physical energy, it is as well for the preacher to warn his listeners, when he is approaching a difficult passage, that it will call for a special effort on their part.

(3) If a pattern is so important to right perception, a preacher should not only construct his sermon clearly, but also allow the listener to see his construction lines by describing the main headings in advance. At the same time he must not give everything away or neglect the rhetorical aids of suspense and surprise.

(4) If there is a time lag between the listener's hearing the words and perceiving their meaning, a pause after an important point must help to let the perception work. For have we not all been caught, thinking about one point that has just been made, and so missing the next three points the speaker may be making?

Most of these principles apply to all public speaking. But in conclusion it must be noted that Christian truth seems to bring the powers of evil into particular play against us. For there seems to be in human beings not only a defensive mechanism against the unfamiliar already referred to, but also an evil, obstinate bias, which builds up a particular resistance to the Word of God, so that, in the startling words of Christ himself, "seeing they may see and *not* perceive, and hearing they may hear and *not* understand, lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them" (Mark 4. 12).

To overcome this resistance, we need most of all to try to keep the atmosphere of prayer all the time we are preaching or listening to sermons. For what is it that gives Billy Graham's message its power of penetration—not for all, but certainly for some? What sends it down *from the attention to the perception*, from the head to the heart? The reason, I believe, is that it's not only carried there with words, but also prayed there. Every meeting is backed by prayer, and Graham always creates that still atmosphere of prayer before he speaks.

In short, the spoken word is still one of God's chief means of communicating with men through men. Given these conditions, it is still, as Hebrews 4. 12 says, "sharper than any two-edged sword".

And it will still in 1956 have the same effect it had on the day of Pentecost, when, as Acts 2. 37 tells us, following St Peter's sermon, "many were pricked to their heart . . . and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls".

O. J. W. Hunkin.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. F. S. Gray is a Fellow of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

Dr Kilpatrick is Dean Ireland's Professor in the University of Oxford.

The Rev. Oliver Hunkin has just been appointed Assistant Head of Religious Broadcasting at the B.B.C.

CORRESPONDENCE

ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON AND THE CHURCH

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I should be grateful if I might be allowed to make some comments on Dr Moorman's article in your July issue. Archbishop Davidson was a lifelong friend of my father, and therefore known to me when I was a boy and a young man. I was Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Chichester at the time when Dr Bell was writing the Life of the Archbishop, and in consequence I was able to read all the Davidson Papers referred to in the preface to that Life, besides a quantity of other material. The portrait which Dr Moorman sketches appears to me to be strangely distorted.

Let me deal first with Dr Moorman's methods. In order to illustrate his thesis that to Davidson "the Church was primarily the guardian of morality", Dr Moorman quotes a sentence from his Visitation Charge of 1912: " 'We must leave no one in any doubt,' he says, 'as to our chief purpose and aim, the definite bettering of the moral standard of our common life.' " Dr Moorman places a full stop at the end of that passage, but there is no full stop in the original, only a comma, and the passage continues, "a bettering which, we are firmly persuaded, will come about in proportion as the Gospel message in its fulness and its strength gains its hold upon their hearts." In the penultimate paragraph of his article Dr Moorman reproaches the Archbishop for what he omits to say in his Visitation Charge. But he never tells the reader that the Archbishop explicitly disclaimed the intention of dealing with these aspects of his large subject. "You, of course, realize that I am not referring now to the fundamentals of the Faith, the great truths common to Christianity throughout the world." "My object in this Visitation Charge has been, as you are aware, to call attention to the grave practical question: How are we, officers of the Church of England, answering

to such distinctive trust as has in the Providence of God been laid upon us?"

It is surprising to find that Dr Moorman does not try to set the Archbishop's Charge in its proper context of the state of religion in England in 1912, any more than he attempts to show the position of the Primate in our national life in 1912 when discussing his interest in the political questions of the day. It must be remembered that these were days before the passing of the Enabling Act, and when all Church legislation had to be debated not in the Church Assembly but in Parliament. It is well known that Archbishop Davidson, like other great Church leaders before him, took a keen interest in moral and social problems of the day, and was most anxious that the voice of the Church should be heard when they were under public discussion, as indeed with all issues affecting the national welfare. In his Winchester Charge of 1899 he stated his conviction: "Bishops, in short, are entrusted, as I believe, with a place in the Legislature not only for what are technically called ecclesiastical questions, but for whatever things directly concern the moral life and the social well-being of the English people." Because this aspect of his work loomed large in the public eye and took up much of his time, it does not mean that the more specifically ecclesiastical work was set aside or that he was unconcerned with the Church's supernatural function.

Dr Moorman tells us that "it is doubtful if [Davidson] ever paused to think what the Church was, or even what message of hope was entrusted to its keeping by Christ." That is a grave charge, which should require full and careful justification. In making it, Dr Moorman does not himself seem to have paused to think how it was, if that were so, that Davidson could have become such a trusted friend and counsellor of a man like Archbishop Benson. It should be remembered that among Davidson's closest friends were men like Westcott and Stubbs, Paget and Talbot and Gore, all of them strong Churchmen. Dr Moorman's article does not take into account the content of Davidson's sermons, many of which are available in print. He ignores Davidson's frequent references to the works of Hooker and Andrewes and Cosin and Jewel and other Anglican divines, and his appeals to the tradition of Dean Church and Dr Pusey and other great Churchmen. He disregards the evidence supplied by letters to individuals, many of them published in the Life, including the important correspondence with Bishop Gore. Some reference might have been expected in this context to Davidson's handling of such subjects as Prayer Book revision, or the Malines conversations, or the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The 1912 Charge was not the only Charge or Presidential Address in which the Archbishop dealt with the character and call of the Church of England. Dr Moorman makes no allusion to Davidson's primary address to the Rochester Diocesan Conference in 1891, of which the Life records that "some elderly clergy, not given to enthusiasm, remarked that they had heard nothing which inspired them so much since they had been ordained." There is no reference to Davidson's Visitation Charge in 1899 as Bishop of Winchester, "wherein I tried to deal with thoroughness as

well as fairness with two great questions—Eucharistic worship and Confession." "Sixty-seven pages in all, that is over one-third of the whole Charge, were devoted to 'the Holy Communion' "—so we are told in the Life. No mention is made of Davidson's addresses to the clergy of the diocese of Canterbury during the National Mission in 1916, about which one of the clergy who was present wrote that "you would have thought that the Archbishop had been taking Quiet Days for Clergy all his life". These omissions raise the question whether Dr Moorman has properly examined the evidence before reaching his verdict.

Yours truly,
LANCELOT MASON.

THE CHANTRY, CHICHESTER.
15 *July* 1956.

THE REVISED PSALTER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It is surprising that during all the years in which the Revised Psalter has been in use no protest has been made against the deplorable treatment of some of the finest Psalms. One can pay too high a price for avoiding the possible occurrence of an inappropriate Psalm on one or two Sundays in the year. Psalm 136, that inspiring war song, is relegated to one (unimportant) Sunday, and others fare no better. But the worst instance of all is Psalm 145, which is removed from its time-honoured place at Evensong on Whit-Sunday, a great occasion, to the Eve, a time so bound up with a popular holiday season as to preclude, in the great majority of our churches, a well-attended (or choral) service. Of this Psalm Dr Kirkpatrick points out that "this noble doxology is the only Psalm which bears the title Tehillāh = a Praise", and he emphasizes its special appropriateness as a Proper Psalm for Whit-Sunday, "as celebrating the universality and eternity of the Kingdom of God". In the Liturgy of the Jewish Church it is recited three times daily. "It is regarded as of paramount importance because it contains the doctrine of God's all-embracing love. . . . It became a model of the *imitatio dei* . . . it would so mould a man's character that by daily recitation he could become a saint" (H. M. Loewe, *A Rabbinic Anthology*). Yet in our Christian worship it is appointed for one Sunday only, Trinity 25, which is *not* a festival of praise.

There is much to be said for a revision of our present Psalter, but as the Psalms are now less in evidence than ever before, it is most unlikely to happen.

Yours faithfully,
(MISS) E. M. BULLOCK.

ST RULE,
WINDERMERE.

BOOK REVIEWS

Essays in Christology for Karl Barth. Edited by T. H. L. Parker. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

Church Dogmatics. By Karl Barth. Vol. 1, "The Doctrine of the Word of God," Part 2. (English translation edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance.) T. and T. Clark. 50s.

It was a happy thought of Dr Barth's British admirers that a *Festschrift* for his seventieth birthday should take the form of a book of essays in Christology. The presentation ceremony at Lambeth Palace was symbol enough of recognition that the ogre is after all a *nice* giant and that the bogey-man is a genial, friendly guest at tea. One still occasionally hears vaguely hostile references to "Barthianism" or (in a public meeting, describing Barth's influence at an ecumenical conference) of "a one-sided emphasis on the sovereignty of God"! But meanwhile, by action and reaction, he has been largely instrumental in changing the theological outlook of his age, and the most suitable birthday present from these islands would be a book of essays showing the same theological concern as is dear to the Grand Old Man himself.

The essayists are a mixed team: three of them Anglican (the Editor, Church of England; two, Scottish Episcopalian), five are Church of Scotland (one exiled in Leeds), three English Congregationalists, one an English and the last an Irish Presbyterian. Many are professors, but some are in the parochial ministry. All, as the editor says in his happily phrased prefatory letter addressed to Dr Barth, "respect and admire your work as a theologian and churchman. . . . Without being Barthians, we recognize the importance of your work for our own Churches, and are happy to take this opportunity of thanking you publicly".

Professor T. F. Torrance opens with an essay on "The Place of Christology in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology". It is not that "all theology can be reduced to Christology, but because there is only one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, in the orderly presentation of the doctrines of the Christian faith, every doctrine will be expressed . . . in its correspondence to the objective reality of God's revelation in Jesus Christ". The Bible is to be seen as human *lalia,* understood and interpreted faithfully in accordance with the *Logos*—this is the work of Biblical theology. Dogmatic theology reveals "a structural and essentially Christological pattern running through the whole body of our theological knowledge". This pattern derives from, and reposes upon, the structure of the incarnation, the hypostatic union seen as both *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia.* This distinction recurs in two other writers, J. B. Torrance and D. T. Jenkins; *anhypostasia* stressing that the human nature of Christ had no independent subsistence apart from the incarnation, whilst *enhypostasia* stresses that the human nature was given a real and concrete subsistence *within* the hypostatic union. *Both* emphases must always be guarded if theology is to work out

from its Christ-centre without distortion. Dr Marsh writes illuminatingly about typology in his essay on "Christ in the Old Testament", on the basis of an analysis of the nature of history. Typology is the illumination of history by history (instead of by abstractions). But, if this is to be meaningful, history must have within it one point which is central in the sense that it explains other events without any previous reference. Moses occupies that point in the Old Testament, and he, in his turn, with all that surrounds him (Exodus, Passover, Red Sea, etc.) is subordinated to Christ as the centre of the New. Mr Cranfield, writing on the witness of the New Testament to Christ, zestfully assails Dr Bultmann and analyses the depths of meaning in Jesus Nazarenus (historical figure); Dominus; Cum esset Dives; Egenus factus; Ad dexteram Dei; Et venientem; through a rich collection of New Testament cross-references. Professor James Haire of Belfast writes "On Behalf of Chalcedon", charging monophysitism, albeit of opposite kinds, against nineteenth-century liberals and their heirs on one hand and, with a disarming confession that he may have misunderstood them, against Fr Lionel Thornton and Dr Mascall in having gone to the other extreme of suggesting that the human is made akin to the divine through the Incarnation. "Reconciliation rather than divinization is at the centre of the Biblical teaching on the work of Christ for Man"—but the error, on either side, lies in too great a desire to *explain* what Chalcedon was content to affirm.

Mr Whitehouse (on "Christ and Creation") asks, "What is it that moves the believer to worship Christ as co-agent of Creation?" He finds the answer in the area of Christ's revelation of the meaning of Man by himself *being* "the proper Man"—and commends Dr Charles Raven's attempt (in his recent Gifford lectures) to vindicate so "anthropocentric" a view of creation in the face of a total history of nature. But the work of the eternal Logos in creation is a truth which the theologian must play his part with the artist, the technician, the politician, and the ordinary worker to interpret in terms convincing to the modern mind. Dr Bromiley writes of the Holy Spirit as inseparable, in Bible theology, from the Word-made-flesh, whose coming in history was accompanied by works of the Spirit, whose abiding is revealed by the Spirit and whose sonship and ministry is reproduced in the Church by the Spirit. Mr Jenkins (to anticipate his place in the sequence of essays) is also much concerned with the Holy Spirit in writing of the Ecumenical Movement as being not only the attempt to understand afresh the meaning of the Church by leading all "churches" back to Christology as the basis of ecclesiology, but also the setting in which a proper attention to the living reality of the Spirit will release all "churches" into a proper self-criticism and awareness, an appreciation of the true purposes of church order and a deep hopefulness that the barriers to unity can be overcome.

On "The Priesthood of Jesus", Mr James Torrance writes of the Atonement, invoking *anhypostasia* and *enhypostasia* to illuminate the meaning of "substitution": the former emphasizing that God substitutes himself for us; the latter that the man Jesus is substituted

for us. But this is only one aspect of a serious dogmatic exposition in the soundest Scottish tradition. Mr Parker, the editor, has chosen as his own theme to vindicate, courageously facing its meaning for our regular Sunday sermons, the daring phrase in the Second Helvetic Confession, *Praedicatio verbi Dei est verbum Dei.* Professor J. K. S. Reid, in "A Christological View of the Sacraments", suggests three ways in which the meaning of the dominical sacraments is distorted when there is not a firm grasp on the full Christology behind them; *naturalization* when the "fittingness" of the elements is emphasized (water for cleansing, bread and wine for nourishment) more than the Lord's authority which appointed them; *spiritualization* which emphasizes the subjective factors more than the committing of himself to material things which marked both the Lord's incarnation and his institution of sacraments; *transubstantiation,* the rationalizing of the sacramental mystery rather than acceptance of the sovereign grace which is the Lord's own initiative, so that the elements are accorded an efficacy in themselves, apart from the action of the Giver. His distinctions are over-simplified in this summarizing, but they are clearly "Protestant" in their trend, though he closes by quoting, with approval, passages from K. E. Kirk and the Roman Catholic M. Schmaus, which emphasize the sovereignty of God over his sacraments.

Professor David Cairns ("Christ, the Church and His Body, and Its Members") joins issue with the late Fr Mersch, S.J., and Dr Mascall for misrepresenting the Protestant teaching on the Church, but space forbids even an outline of his defence of the teaching of Luther and Calvin. Perhaps Dr Mascall himself will take occasion to comment. Mr R. S. Wallace writes of "The Christian Life" with that reiterated vagueness which seems to beset "Barthian" (though not Karl Barth's) writing on ethics, perhaps in fear lest it seem to talk "casuistry". "This mystery of God with us which became event once for all in Jesus Christ becomes event again and again in the preaching of the Word and the celebration of the Sacraments. But this mystery must find its counterpart in the immediately related mystery of Christ within his people . . ." is a fair sample of his style.

The final essay by Professor Donald Mackinson stirs a deep but vague excitement in at least one non-philosopher. Starting with a long quotation from Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's essay in *Mysterium Christi,* he writes of the relations between "Christology", "theology", and philosophy, in a sense that "Christology is the name of something that sets in motion, and keeps in restless activity, the whole work of the characteristically Christian theologian". An autobiographical reference to his own passage from Kant to the British nineteenth-century idealists and then on to discover Russell and Moore, illuminates his austere regard for the autonomous integrity of philosophy and his admiration for Barth's positivist and ontological qualities, his "sense of the primacy of what is over our thought of it".

Truly to appreciate the spirit which moves all these contributors, one should turn from the birthday present to its recipient. Comparatively little of Barth's enormous output has been translated into

English. It is twenty-one years since the *Dogmatik* I. 1 was translated, twenty-three years since Hoskyns translated the *Romerbrief*. *Dogmatics in Outline* (S.C.M., 1949) gave an impression of his theological-pastoral vigour, being lectures at his old university (Bonn) on his first post-war return, and *Against the Stream*—shorter post-war writings—(S.C.M., 1954) helps an understanding of why Barth is felt in post-war Europe as a *political* force. Snippets on Baptism, the State, the Holy Spirit, have appeared from time to time. But the 6,000 pages of the *Dogmatik* (after the first half-volume) are known only by hearsay to us who cannot read German—or at any rate Barth's German. Now arrives the second half-volume, 884 pages, *arrabon* of the gigantic promise to translate it all in due time.

It would be frivolous in a short review, and impertinent in the present writer, to pretend to any assessment of the theological achievement this volume represents. It is possible only to bear testimony to the obvious truth that there is no substitute for reading Barth himself, even in translation. The translators and editors confess to the difficulty of their task—they hold Barth to be, strictly, untranslatable. His vigour, humour and prodigious sentences do not go into English. But his *style* is communicated, and its tremendous verbosity is a deliberate part of his "dogmatic procedure". As he circles round and round and round his subject, and then dives fathoms deep into a footnote, the whole massive structure takes shape. It is quite unquoteable, but the total effect, however much one quarrels here and there, or even fiercely resents this or that, is to bring home, as no other writer succeeds in doing, that theology is the homage of man's mind to the immeasurable majesty of the Living God. That is why we all have reason to greet Karl Barth with gratitude and to join with the Editor of his *festschrift* in hoping "that the time for completion (of his theological work) should be given him, if God will, and that more and more his living influence should pass from land to land".

LINCOLN. OLIVER TOMKINS.

OLD PRIEST AND NEW PRESBYTER. By Norman Sykes. Cambridge University Press. 27s. 6d.

This important and challenging book by the Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge comprises his Gunning Lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh (1953-4) as expanded in his Edward Cadbury Lectures in the University of Birmingham (1944-5), and constitutes the first magisterial and systematic contribution to the subject since Dr A. J. Mason's *The Church of England and Episcopacy* (1914). It is also very obviously a tract for the times: for, as Dr Sykes tells us, "the manuscript of the lectures was sent to press before the first meeting of the Joint Committee of the Convocations of Canterbury and York on the Church of South India (on which I had the privilege of serving)." A good deal of water has flowed beneath ecclesiastical bridges between 1914 and 1955.

A quotation from Dr Mason's preface to *The Church of England and Episcopacy* may be permitted. "It is by no means the first time," he wrote, "that a collection of this kind has been attempted. Some writers have endeavoured to prove that Anglicans have always treated episcopacy as of the *esse* of the Church. Others have endeavoured to prove that Anglicans have always fraternized with protestants, episcopal or not. I do not profess to be impartial. I am convinced that to tamper with episcopacy would be to throw away all that is most distinctive in the character and prospects of the Church of England. But I have desired to show fairly how matters have stood, and to bring out not only the earnestness with which our writers have contended for the apostolic and divine institution of episcopacy, but also their wish to make out the best possible case for those who had a different polity, while aiming in the main at promoting a scriptural and spiritual Christianity. . . . I have not tried to make my catena complete and exhaustive. . . . But . . . I believe that the passages here given represent accurately and with sufficient fulness the mind of the English church from age to age. . . . The impression left is complex; but I think that no one who follows the evidence can doubt that the Church of England stands for episcopacy with a resolution peculiarly its own."

Professor Sykes's book carries as its sub-title upon the title-page "Episcopacy and Presbyterianism since the Reformation, with especial relation to the Churches of England and Scotland", and upon the jacket, "The Anglican attitude to episcopacy, presbyterianism and papacy since the Reformation". The subject is one on which he has been working for a considerable period of years. In the brilliant and memorable essay on "The Ideal of a National Church" which he contributed to the symposium, *The Church and the Twentieth Century* (ed. G. L. H. Harvey: 1936), he criticized the omission from P. E. More and F. L. Cross, *Anglicanism* (1935), of "all reference to and evidence of the custom of occasional conformity" in the seventeenth-century Church of England, appealed from the Tractarians to the Caroline Divines, and argued that the ideal of the National Church should be that avowed by Archbishop Sancroft of "a universal blessed union of all reformed churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies"; and urged that, as practical steps towards the realization of this ideal, the restrictive clause in the declaration required from applicants for inclusion in the Electoral Roll should be removed, and Nonconformists welcomed as occasional communicants at the altars of the Established Church "as an eirenical and religious custom". Twelve years later, in a THEOLOGY occasional paper on "The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", he wrote: "It is in the combination of a positive affirmation of the value of episcopacy and of a refusal to assert for it an exclusive claim that the *differentia* of the Anglican tradition consists. In defence of its own history and position the Church of England stands firmly by its retention of episcopacy; in looking forward to the possibility of ecclesiastical reunion, it affirms that such union must find its indis-

pensable basis in the episcopal form of church-polity; and at the same time it refuses to unchurch non-episcopal churches and preserves an historical tradition of communion with them."

The present volume is an elaboration of that theme. It is, of course, a scrupulously fair-minded and, on the whole, a remarkably objective work. The argument is supported, but never over-burdened, with quotations from an impressive series of Anglican divines, and is enriched (as will be immediately apparent from the index) by the author's unrivalled familiarity with the mind of Archbishop Wake. These quotations are set in their historic context; and it is suggested that there were three epochs, in particular, when the Church of England reconsidered or revised its attitude to "the apostolic and divine institution of episcopacy", namely, between 1593 and 1608, between 1643 and 1662, and between 1833 and 1850. (It is a legitimate minor criticism of this book that the quotations are not invariably dated.)

The book must be read for itself, and it most certainly must be read, and studied and digested. But the reviewer may be allowed to put forward some general observations.

1. The appeal to history cannot be neglected; nor are we even likely to regard it, with Cardinal Manning, as "a treason and a heresy". But, for a living Church, history is not the only, not the final, court of appeal.

2. The limitations of the controversial method of argument by catenation are illustrated by the *Tracts for the Times* upon the one hand, and by the counterblasts of the Rev. Nathaniel Dimock on the other. (But, as has already been said, Professor Sykes is too good an historian not to relate his authorities to their historical environment.)

3. The history of the Church of England does not begin (as this book begins) with the Elizabethan Settlement, nor does it end with South India.

4. If we believe—and there is nobody more qualified than the ecclesiastical historian to know how abundantly this belief is justified in history—that the Holy Spirit is guiding the Church into all truth, then we are bound to recognize, not only that tradition is a good servant but bad master, but also that no ecclesiastical position can ever claim an absolute finality. It is not merely that circumstances alter cases, or that the exception tests the rule (as when the ineffable stupidity of James II forced the Church of England, including ultimately the Non-Jurors, to abandon its traditional adherence to the medieval doctrine of Non-Resistance to arbitrary, if legitimate, authority), but rather that, in the immortal words of John Robinson of Leyden to the pilgrims on the *Mayflower*, "the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of His holy Word": and this requires to be remembered by liberal as well as by conservative theologians. The mind of the Church is continually developing and changing (as, for example, in the contemporary Church of Rome, to the evident embarrassment of the little papalist faction in our midst, which finds itself abruptly called upon to burn what it has adored, and to adore what it has burned): and, in the classic statement of the

Dean of York and the late Canon Wilfred Knox in *One God and Father of All* (1929), "the only authority in the Catholic Church which can ultimately preserve the truth is the power of the Holy Ghost to guide theologians in the end to a true understanding of the Faith", by the ordinary processes of trial and error but subject to Divine overruling.

5. Finally, all discussions of episcopacy as an institution must be sterile and ultimately misleading if they are not based upon a proper and a pastoral understanding of the nature and meaning and significance of the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God. (This, for example, is primary and fundamental to any consideration of the problem of Intercommunion.) We have abundant reason to be grateful to Professor Sykes for giving us the fruit of his historical research in *Old Priest and New Presbyter,* which must be read (like the Apocrypha) for example of life and instruction of manners: but we should be ill advised not to extend our reading to include the sermon on "The Consecration of Bishops" in F. D. Maurice's *The Church a Family* (1850), especially pp. 189–191; and the sermon entitled "A Father in Christ" which Liddon preached at the Consecration of Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln, on St Mark's Day, 1885, and which is printed in his *Clerical Life and Work* (1897: 4th impression, 1907), especially pp. 298–308.

St Margaret's Rectory, 20 Dean's Yard, Westminster. Charles Smyth.

Christianity and Symbolism. By F. W. Dillistone. Collins. 21s.

Here is, without a doubt, an outstandingly important book: it is scholarly, profound, learned over a very wide range, up to date, and timely in its appearance. For it *is* time for an important Anglican contribution to the discussion of a, if not the, leading question of our age—the significance, the loss, and the rediscovery of our symbols. All this in high praise; but by reason of its dimensions, its breadth, and its depth rather than its length, you must not expect it to be easy reading. It is compact and closely argued, it carries a weight of learning culled from widely diverse sources, and it takes the reader deep into the recesses of the human spirit.

In his first six chapters the Dean of Liverpool treats of the ecology of our symbols: how did symbols arise, what did they originally mean, to what deep-seated human need did they respond? To answer these questions we are led back into pre-history, to the dawn of time: symbols are of five types, associated with Nature, Time, the Leader, Language, and ritual action. The pattern of each is established and then we are shown its relevance to the explanation of Biblical, political, and Church history. The argument is illustrated by lucid schemata or analogies which might almost be diagrammatically represented. The fundamental premiss is stated on page 296: "Man cannot exist as man without symbols; they are, as Whitehead wrote, 'inherent in the very texture of human life.'" Elsewhere, on page 180, the author says: "Without the support of a symbolic encourage-

ment of this kind (i.e. the dramatic representation of crisis turned to conquest, death turned to new life) it is difficult to see how primitive man could have been sustained in his journey through life." The need of modern man for a fundamental rhythm and pattern is just as deep-seated. The anthropologists who may have uncovered sources of human behaviour have not changed human nature: to have explained symbols in their origin is not to have explained them away.

The second half of the book is concerned with the specifically Christian symbols, Baptism and the Eucharist. As to the first, Water-symbolism represents invigoration: this thesis is illustrated from primitive lore, from psychology, from poetry, and from the imagery of the Fathers, especially Cyril of Jerusalem, and of the Sarum rite. But modern sophistication has obscured the wealth of association: "to find a way of allowing Baptism to exercise its power within the Christian community at the deepest level of the human psyche is one of the most urgent tasks of our day." No one can read this chapter without deepening his preaching about Baptism, his preparation for Confirmation, and his concern to restore to this rite in the ecumenical Church the fullness of Christian tradition and teaching.

Why is it that down the ages sacrifice has played a central part in human experience? What was first meant by it? No single theory will cover all the facts. In the realms of primitive purpose revealed by anthropology we find that men offer an object representing life to pass through death in order to increase the life-substance. Jung found the origin of sacrifice in man coming to terms with death. In this offering men participate together, creating a bond between each other and between themselves and their God. Pertinently Dr Dillistone quotes V. Van der Leeuw: "I cannot perceive any contradiction, such as Luther did, in the fact that the same entity is simultaneously received and offered. On the contrary, it is precisely the essence of all sacrifice that it should be at the same time an offering and a receiving."

The Passover, a communal feast, provides the original background to the Eucharist. In the second century there enters the idea of life-giving food, to become in succeeding ages increasingly prominent. There follows a summary account of the emphases laid at the various stages of Church history, especially in the West, by Romans and Reformers; then a definition is attempted which seeks to do justice to the four cultural traditions in which Eucharistic doctrine has grown up: the Greek, the Roman, the Hebraic, and the Jerusalemite.

This study makes important reading for a foundation of mutual understanding and appreciation in talks concerning Reunion. It is an impressive amplification of the Report of Section 3 at the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order in 1937. The problems of our day are set in their historical perspective, and the author attempts to pioneer a way forward towards recovery of deep truths which have been lost sight of or overlaid. Fr Gerald Vann from the Roman side, Professor Paul Tillich from the Protestant, Jung from the psychological angle, and the poets from theirs, are at one with Dr Dillistone in lamenting the loss of symbolism in our age. Continuous interplay

between the conscious and unconscious layers is essential for psychic health. The Christian Church faces the necessity of discovering new symbolic forms related to the old archetypal forms but relevant to present circumstances. "Mechanization . . . and standardization . . . mean that the patterns and standards of the technological age have laid hold of the human mind and imagination." But the new symbols are superficial and transitory. The Christian symbols have qualities which make them patient of a new and reinforced significance today. This can hopefully be based on a reviving respect for Nature, forced on us by such spectacular lessons as soil erosion, and on the urgent need for inter-personal relationships in a day of accelerated communication. The question is, How in megalopolis shall the Church present in their full significance symbols first rooted in nomadic or agricultural societies?

Misprints have been noticed on p. 201 (wrong breathing on a Greek word), p. 210, and p. 285.

King Edward's School,
Birmingham.

Ronald Lunt.

SHORTER NOTICES

An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek. By J. H. Moulton. Fifth Edition revised by H. G. Meecham. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

This revised edition of a work which was first published over sixty years ago should be welcomed by all teachers of New Testament Greek. That the book has in recent years largely fallen out of use has been due to the indecent haste with which many men nowadays have to acquire a superficial smattering of New Testament Greek. They have consequently had recourse to books which will enable them quickly and with a minimum of effort to acquire a deceptive ability to translate the New Testament. To work patiently through this book will take longer, but it will provide the beginner with a solid foundation on which he can progressively build, and the beginnings of a real understanding of the niceties of the language.

The present revision makes little change in the original design of the book, and is mainly confined to the addition of numerous and valuable footnotes. Especially useful, both for student and teacher, are the references to larger works for a fuller treatment of particular points. That so little change was necessary both in the general lay-out and in detail shows how well the book has stood the test of time. And we hope that it may now become the standard introduction for the beginner.

It may be noted, as an interesting sign of the times, that, whereas Moulton, in his preface to Vol. I of his *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (published in 1906) said that "the text which is assumed throughout is naturally that of Westcott and Hort", in the present work that text is omitted altogether from the list of "Books necessary for the Beginner".

Emmanuel College,
Cambridge.

† H. Burnaby.

Elizabeth of Dijon. By H. Urs von Balthasar. Translated and adapted by A. V. Littledale. Harvill Press. 12s. 6d.

This is a companion piece to the author's study of Ste Thérèse of Lisieux, and concerns another Carmelite nun who, in a short time, fulfilled much, dying in 1905 in her twenty-sixth year. Very different in temperament certainly from Ste Thérèse, she was influenced by the writings of that saint, integrating "the 'little way' of Teresa of Lisieux into her own thought, linking it closely with the epistle to the Romans and St Paul's doctrine of justification". It was, in fact, Elizabeth's mission to live herself and to help others to live in the light and in the depths of that scripture in which Paul speaks of predestination: not Calvin's individualist conception of it—she draws the sting from Calvinism—but the scriptural conception: "To the profane thinker, the 'reprobation' of some seems to follow necessarily from the 'election' of others. To the believer, whose thought is formed by Scripture, that is completely alien, for the election spoken of in the Bible, even when applied to individuals, has always a social reference." Nor any more than Teresa's is Elizabeth's "way" just for cloistered contemplatives: to be *in actione contemplativus* is the norm for us all.

Beaumont. H. D. Hanshell, S.J.

The Bent World. By J. V. L. Casserley. Oxford University Press. 21s.

Dialogue on Destiny. By G. W. Barrett and J. V. L. Casserley. Longmans. 4s.

All the characteristics we should expect from Dr Casserley are packed into *The Bent World*. We see his deep veneration for the Western Christian tradition, a monolithic concept of the Catholic Church, a Christian conservatism, an exhilarating confidence, and a suspicion of secular radicalism, technology, and a positive dislike of Puritanism. He knows where he stands if other men don't, and his certain position deeply colours his main theme—the resuscitation of the Western Christian tradition in the face of an incipient Marxism in the West, the "deification" of democracy, and our "obsessions" with technics, economic activities, and economic doctrines. Perhaps too much of Casserley is in this book, and a general criticism might be made that he gives the impression of shooting down impoverished shallow mortals, with their inadequate philosophy, as they wrestle with the democratic processes of government, with the intricacies of our economy, and with the running of our industrial organizations, from too high an ivory tower. It is too easy to see the weaknesses of such mortals.

To give an example. Casserley is right that democracy does not provide the absolute ethic and ultimate religion that many heady democrats have thought (although perhaps there are not enough of them to-day), and his analysis of the weaknesses of the democratic process is superb. But his statement that "Christianity cannot affirm

democracy as essential to itself" is questionable. Of course the Church succeeded in existing centuries before the democratic state, but he takes too static, too monolithic a view of the Church, whose task, I submit, is not merely to exist as a city on a hill, but also to stain the world of its age and to realize the potentialities of each age. This is to put democracy (with its rare qualities that Casserley sees so well) into a unique relationship to the Church and to Christianity in the mid-20th century. It will not produce the Kingdom of God, but look at the Communist countries, at South Africa, the Arab world, and the significance of democracy as a basis of any state concerned with the human and the personal is clear. Paul Blanshard, therefore, is right (see p. 62) in laying bare the anti-democratic tendencies in the Roman Catholic Church—not because democracy or democrats are without error, but because of the proper concern of a prophetic Church in this epoch.

But this is just an illustration, necessarily out of its wide context, of a trend one perceives in the book. It is a book that those immersed in the practical affairs of this world would find of great help. The last chapter on the secularity of the West is the best—a quite excellent chapter in which some very wise words are addressed to the Churches.

The little book *Dialogue on Destiny* is based on "dialogue sermons" that took place in 1953 in Trinity Church, Wall Street, New York, the actors being the two authors. The theme is the Last Things. I have no experience of such a technique—it seems that with the two "razor-sharp minds" the congregation was greatly helped. The danger of lesser men using the technique, one feels, might be the erection of unreal Aunt Sallies to be smashed to pieces.

SHEFFIELD. E. R. WICKHAM.

ENGLISH THOUGHT 1860-1900. THE THEOLOGICAL ASPECT. By L. E. Elliott-Binns. Longmans. 28s.

"What giants they were," observed Bishop Frere in a sermon preached towards the end of his life in the Community Chapel at Mirfield, when referring to the theologians of the later part of the 19th century. In just such a mood one lays down Dr Elliott-Binns' comprehensive account of their work with a deep sense of gratitude for their faith and for their labours.

Whatever else is doubtful about the outcome of their work, one thing is plain. They made it possible for an educated Englishman in the 20th century to feel at home in the Church of England. They met the first shock of historical criticism applied to the Bible, of the doctrine of evolution and the spectacular development of physical science, of the new interest in archaeology and comparative religion. If English Christians who are acquainted with the new learning can now hold the faith without sacrificing the smallest particle of their respect for truth, we owe that privilege to the wisdom and patience and learning of such scholars as Lightfoot, Hort and Church.

It is on the popular parochial level that their success is less evident, though—let us be fair—without the educated minority of

churchmen who owe them so much, the Church would not now be operating on the parochial level at all. The popular view of the late Victorian age, at least in rural areas, is of an age of faith in which everyone came to church. The majority of the present members of the Church of England have not the remotest idea that the religious disturbance described in Dr Elliott-Binns's volume was then going on. They feel the unsettlement now and are dimly aware of all the problems. But the answers of the giants are not acceptable because they are not simple. The new view of the Bible, for example, is by no means as well suited as the old one to be an authority for simple souls. If one's sexton is passionately curious about what happened in the beginning of the world, he is apt to feel cheated when told that he has the kind of curiosity which the Bible does not satisfy.

However, the parish priest has much to gain from reading this book. If he has felt the difficulties raised by our 19th-century forebears, he will find here their answers. It is better to handle the popular arguments against our faith in peace of mind than secretly to feel that there is much in them which has never been dealt with. From this anxiety the giants have delivered us. From the other trouble, that popular religion demands simple infallibilities, and that the Church of England has no infallibilities to offer, perhaps no deliverance is possible. One should not complain if the Victorians have left us no simple hand-outs to combat the new learning, now that it has reached the parishes. It is much that they have enabled us to carry on.

THURCASTON. A. C. SCUPHOLME.

CHRISTIAN FOCUS. By A. R. Wallace. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

OTHERWORLDLINESS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Amos N. Wilder. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANITY. By J. B. Phillips. Hodder and Stoughton. 10s. 6d.

It has been said that the purpose of preaching is "to make the word of God contemporary", and this is no easy task to-day. Mr Phillips writes as a busy parish priest who has "lived" fourteen years with the Greek of the New Testament and has become widely known for his brilliant modern translations. And in this intensive effort to communicate its meaning in our modern idiom he has been newly awakened to the sheer spiritual zest of the early Christians, and it has led him to this study of the distinguishing marks of New Testament Christianity. He feels the air of the churches to be stale and stuffy, and yet there are thousands who long for the fresh air of the New Testament. His central theme is the conviction that our small and insignificant planet is the "visited planet" in which God was focused in a human life. Mr Wilder, in his lectures given to theological students in U.S.A. (he teaches at the Harvard Divinity School), speaks of the false otherworldliness which tends to make the churches seem like much traditional art—"marginal, decorative, optional"—and the

need to reinterpret the Gospel in terms of a real application to the secular affairs of men. When the N.T. speaks of the Kingdom of God, the Messiah, the Saviour, these words were "banners and fuses and sparks", and Christ was a real man grappling with real problems and through this struggle revealing God to men. He appeals to the puzzled decent man of to-day to recognize that the Bible is on his side and that "any salvage operations for . . . prisoners, conscripts, robots, hollow men, ghost lives, and men and women generally in this 'age of anxiety' cannot be effected by strains of ravishing celestial music or by invocation of a deus ex machina or voice from heaven. It can only be effected by immanent creative and redemptive operations in the situation, the 'grass roots', or rather in the jungle of the common life." Christianity is still good news of "the inexhaustible generosities of God", and he quotes Dylan Thomas, "Light breaks where no sun shines". So Mr Phillips insists that man needs saving from hopelessness and materialism rather than from the sins which the popular mass evangelist denounces. The Dean of Exeter in his little book also endeavours to show the relevance of the Christian Faith for the whole of life. He brings into the picture economics and history, the administration of justice, education and marriage, leisure and recreation, and a chapter on the Church. The intention is admirable, the execution for one reader is open to criticism. Somehow his Christian pattern turns out to be surprisingly like the "British Way of Life". One is a little staggered to be told that in the crisis of national history men and women of "*quite abnormal power and wisdom*" were raised up as the spearhead of our deliverance, such as "King George V or VI . . . Haig, Alexander and Montgomery . . . Lloyd George and Winston Churchill". There is much that is excellent and edifying in this book, but for one who now lives in the midst of the Asian revolution and resurgent non-Christian faiths this approach to history and the life of the Church seems somewhat provincial and limited, and at least one reference to India will be offensive to many; the Dean was once a member of the Indian Civil Service, but left it in 1922, and much has happened since then. How easy it is for our national prejudices and temperament unconsciously to colour our Christian interpretation. It is significant that this book never wanders outside the tidy confines of Anglican Matins and Evensong and the early Celebration in a side-chapel. The Dean seems unaware of the World Council of Churches or of such movements as Parish and People. I repeat, his intention to make the faith relevant to all life is admirable, but the other two authors are more aware of the dilemmas of our time and their approach to Christianity is more prophetic and likely to be listened to more attentively.

BANGALORE. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

THOMAS CRANMER—THEOLOGIAN. By G. W. Bromiley. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

Most writing about Cranmer tends to forget his theology, unless it makes what is usually a vain attempt to find out what he meant

when he penned some of the Common Prayer. It was not, however, a negligible matter at the time, for although Cranmer did not produce great and systematic statements of the evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, yet he was known and respected in his age as one who could cull skilfully from patristic writing true and catholic doctrine neglected by the medieval thinkers. Nor is it unimportant now, for while the Anglican Church since Hooker and the 17th-century divines cannot be regarded as Cranmerian in thought, Cranmer it was who guided the first formative years in so gentle and cautious a way, albeit in his own writing "the excesses to which some opinions had formerly carried men did in some particulars incline him to the opposite extremes".

This book is a closely written and accurate account of what Cranmer said about Scripture and Tradition, Church and Ministry, Justification and the Sacraments. Most of the material had perforce to be collected from occasional references scattered through the writings, for apart from the voluminous discussions on the Eucharist, Cranmer left no closely reasoned treatises. The pressure under which he often had to state his doctrine and the prejudices and confusion of Reformation days make the task of interpretation difficult, but Dr Bromiley treats Cranmer with an understanding sympathy and takes care to draw out truth often inherent in partly developed insights as well as to expose the error of, for instance, his exaggerated Erastianism.

It is a pity that the author's opinion that "from 1549 to the present day the Church of England has suffered from an inveterate and apparently ineradicable tendency to treat the Prayer Book as a primary and even an autonomous confessional utterance" leads him to lay it so much aside, but as a guide to the Parker Society "Works", to which reference is carefully made, the book is of high value.

HULL. L. C. STANBRIDGE.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN SPAIN. By J. D. Hughey, Jr. Carey Kingsgate Press. 15s.

Having been divided for centuries on the religious issue, we have in this country made a virtue of necessity by developing the practice of religious toleration. During the same period Spain has enjoyed a substantial unity in religion, and for her the arguments for toleration have not assumed the same urgency. Roman Catholicism has come to colour Spanish culture and patriotism, and the more conservative a Spanish government is, the less willing is it to give freedom to religious groups that might in time alter the character of the country. Where Spaniards place a value on unity, Englishmen place it on freedom, and consequently it is not a straightforward matter to apply the ethos of the latter to the affairs of the former.

Nevertheless, the hardships suffered by dissenters in Franco's Spain are such as to give offence in most other civilized countries. There are, after all, profound reasons why each man's choice of faith should

be unhampered, and why even the smallest minority should enjoy the right to practise and propound its beliefs.

On so inflammatory a subject it is a pleasure to read a book that contains not a trace of bad feeling. Mr Hughey supplies a wealth of information on the history of his subject over the past century and a half and does not allow his Protestant sympathies to pervert his pen. The last execution for heresy in Spain was as late as 1826, but Mr Hughey shows how Liberal opinion in Spain was strong enough to secure a large measure of freedom for dissenters during the course of the 19th century. He shows furthermore that, while the fortunes of the dissenters have continually fluctuated, their position under Franco is much worse than in the comparatively recent past. Their existing difficulties embrace not only evangelism, church meetings, education and publishing, but extend to such necessary matters as marriage and burial. The author spent three years in Spain as a representative of the Southern Baptist Convention, and his book, which is both historical and up to date, is a service to those who wish to be well informed on the subject.

VICTOR BENNETT.

HOUNSLOW.

BLESSING UNBOUNDED: A VISION. By Harry Blamires. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Mr Harry Blamires is a Senior Lecturer in English at King Alfred's College, Winchester, a Church of England Training College for men. His two novels, *The Devil's Hunting Ground* and *Cold War in Hell*, are witty journeys of fantasy to Purgatory and Hell. He now ventures to the very gates of the heavenly city. Wisdom and humour accompany him. His themes are the mystery of Faith, ("You will know what you truly wanted only when you have chosen it"), the primacy of will over desire that constitutes human freedom, the experience of penitence in which already we have chosen the good that we formerly rejected, the necessity of accepting forgiveness which is the deepest humiliation of pride and leads to joy. He treats also of that peculiar quality of the modern European intellectual who represents himself thus: "I had to struggle to salvation through despair and self-recrimination. I must make my way to light through error."

At the level of religion there is true humour and much to delight one—Annot, the girl friend of his youth; the half-built council house estate on heaven's fringe; "Pilgrim's Trust Inc.—Organized Processions to suit all tastes"; and much else.

VICTOR DE WAAL.

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
ELY.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

From MOWBRAYS' List

STUDIES IN EPHESIANS. Edited by F. L. CROSS, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford. 12*s.* 6*d.*

These lectures delivered at the last Theology and Ministry Conference at Oxford deal with the authorship and theology of the Epistle. J. N. Sanders, Dean of Peterhouse, and Professor Nineham respectively argue for and against Pauline authorship. The Bishop of Leicester writes on "The Pauline Catechesis", D. E. H. Whiteley on Christology, E. K. Lee on "Unity in Israel and Unity in Christ", S. M. Gibbard on "The Christian Mystery" (the Eucharist), S. F. B. Bedale on "The Theology of the Church", and C. P. M. Jones on "The Calling of the Gentile". The book is a scholarly work which will be of much interest to the clergy and to Bible students generally.

THE PARISH COMES ALIVE. Constructive Thinking on Parish Policy. By Canon E. W. SOUTHCOTT, Vicar of St. Wilfrid's, Halton, Leeds. With a Preface by the Bishop of Ripon, and an Introduction by the Bishop of Knaresborough. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Author of *Receive this Child* here draws on his experience as priest of a courageous pioneer parish to suggest ways in which the Church can best fulfil its vocation in the modern community. Though his (highly successful) methods may seem novel they may be said to derive their inspiration from Apostolic example. There are chapters on the House Church, Training the Congregation, Healing, Liturgy, Church Visiting, etc. The book is a challenge to all parishes to seek to extend the power of the Gospel to every sphere of activity, and, moreover, it has practical force and direction in the procedure it advocates.

DUNCAN-JONES OF CHICHESTER. By the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, D.D., former Dean of Exeter. 11*s.* 6*d.*

The late Dean of Chichester was always a personage to be reckoned with, a vital figure in any circle or debatable matter in which he was interested, like liturgiology or Church music. He had a varied and interesting life, and came in contact with many people of importance. Dr. Carpenter's very attractively written memoir is the outcome not only of many years personal friendship, but of the prompting of such people of importance, and of the late Dean's family.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO MORAL THEOLOGY. By the Rev. Canon LINDSAY DEWAR, B.D. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Originally given as lectures to a group of clergy, this lucid exposition of principles is worthy of the widest possible hearing. The Place of Law in the Christian Religion—The Christian Doctrine of Conscience—Christian Casuistry.

LIFE IN GRACE. Meditations for the Sundays of the Christian Year. By the Rev. M. B. DEWEY, Fellow and Dean of Pembroke College, Cambridge. 5*s.*

These passages were originally written for the *Church Times* as weekly meditations based on subjects suggested by the collect, epistle, or gospel for the Sunday. They are published in book form as the result of many requests, and because of their value as a collection for devotional use.

THE JOYFUL MYSTERIES. By the Rev. KENNETH N. ROSS, Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street. 3*s.*

Father Ross dealt in an earlier work with the Sorrowful Mysteries, and now writes of the Joyful Mysteries associated with the Holy Nativity and the Blessed Childhood. The book is one for spiritual reading and meditation, unattached to any particular season. It has all Father Ross's characteristic thoughtfulness and charity.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO. LTD, 28 Margaret St, London, W.1

35 Pembroke Street, Oxford – 14 King's Parade, Cambridge

And at Leeds, Birmingham, and Manchester

THE NEW TESTAMENT BACKGROUND: SELECTED DOCUMENTS

C. K. Barrett — **25s. net**

A selection of documents, in translation and with notes, throwing light on the background against which the events of the New Testament took place.

ENGLISH AND WELSH CRUCIFIXES, 670-1550

J. Eric Hunt — **25s. net**

Mr Hunt's account of the development of the representation of the Crucifixion is illustrated by 39 photographs of historic and important crucifixes. The general reader, no less than the art historian, will find interest and enjoyment in joining his pilgrimage to the places where these ancient monuments have fortunately been preserved.

PAST FINDING OUT

The tragic story of Joanna Southcott and her Successors

G. R. Balleine — **15s. 6d. net**

The story of Joanna Southcott and the Movement she began is entertaining. It is also more than that; it is instructive. The social historian, the minister of religion, the psychic researcher—all have something to learn from the circumstances, the simple faith and intellectual oddities, and the experiences of precognition and clair-audience of Joanna Southcott. The facts are fantastic; but facts they are. Mr Balleine records them with the historian's objectivity and the skill of the writer.

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE CHURCH

A. E. J. Rawlinson — **5s. net**

The problems discussed in this book are all vitally important for the future of religion in this country, and indeed throughout Christendom: the "Ecumenical Encounter"; Episcopacy and the Anglican Tradition; the relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the general process of Christian initiation; Divorce and Marriage Discipline. There is also a useful list of recommended books on these subjects.